

1271
A 7
SHORT DEFENCE

OF THE DOCTRINE OF
ATONEMENT FOR SIN,
BY THE
Jesus
DEATH OF CHRIST.

K
WITH
REMARKS upon some late Publications on
that Subject.

I will also shew mine opinion.

Job xxxii. 10.

Speaking the truth in love.

Ephes. iv. 15.

EDINBURGH:

Printed for JOHN GUTHRIE, Bookseller,
opposite the Fountain-well, Nether-bow.

M,DCC,LXXXIX.

REPORT DETENIC

OF THE RECORDS OF

A COMMITTEE

OF THE

DEATH OF CHRIST



Presented to the House of Representatives
in the year 1851

Printed by G. W. Johnson, at the
National Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Printed for the Joint Committee on
the Conduct of the War, 1862

W. D. LEXINGTON

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

The Author of the following pages has not made his name known to the Public: but it is generally believed that he is a medical Practitioner, of the first eminence in the North of England, the author of several useful performances in his own department; and by these, and his extensive practice, one who stands high among the number of those who have improved his art. Though the decided adversary of the doctrines which Dr PRIESTLEY has supported with so much zeal and openness, he is yet known as his Coadjutor in philosophical pursuits, and was one of the first who applied his chemical discoveries in the practice of Medicine. These pages will be found altogether free from the *odium theologicum* which so much embitters religious controversy.

Indeed Dr PRIESTLEY demands a sort of regard which is not due to every writer
of

of the same views. He appears to be an honest man. He has violated no solemn subscriptions; and his trumpet, with whatever foul breath it is filled, gives at least a *certain* sound. Perhaps a contrast might here be drawn for the conviction of more than one man in the world, but the Editor leaves it to the feelings of those who, if they chuse to read this dispassionate and candid performance, will judge how far it should affect them. He does not doubt, that if "haply the thoughts of their heart, and their writings, and sermons, be forgiven them," that one of the first fruits of their repentance will be to burn those books which, under the form of godliness, tend to overthrow the power of it.

EDINBURGH,

May 28. 1789.

T H E P R E F A C E.

TH E following observations were in part written before the Public was informed, that the Rev. Dr Priestley was the author of the *Appeal*, and some other tracts which are taken notice of in this essay.* My design being solely to examine sentiments, without any respect to the persons who espouse them, I have chosen to continue the style I had begun to make use of, and to speak of the author as yet unknown. I could not take the same method of avoiding the appearance of personal reflection in examining Mr Graham's letters, because his name was prefixed to them at their first publication: But the freedom used in my remarks upon them is designed to extend no farther than to the writings themselves. I think it a shame for any, who profess themselves candid inquirers after truth, to entertain the least malevolence towards those whose opinions they are opposing, and I am sure that such conduct is contrary to the spirit of Christianity.

I have used the term *Socinian*, to distinguish those who deny the doctrine of atonement,
A both

* See a sermon preached on occasion of his resigning the charge of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters in Leeds.

both as it prevents the necessity of tedious circumlocution, and as it is adopted by the writers whose works I am examining.*

I have informed the reader, in the course of this work, in what sense I use the principal terms belonging to this controversy; and, as far as I know, I have used them according to their most common acceptation. When I speak of repentance, or faith, as being the *condition* of pardon, I mean no more by this mode of expression than to assert, that the pardon of sin, considered as the transgression of the moral law, is never obtained without repentance and faith, and that it is always granted to the repenting and believing sinner. When I call the death of Christ the *consideration* of our forgiveness, it will be sufficient for my argument, if the term *consideration* be construed to imply no more than "something necessary in order" to the pardon of sin;" but I would not be understood to mean, that the death of Christ is not the condition of pardon in a higher sense than our faith and repentance are. I have generally preferred the term *consideration* to that of *condition*, in speaking of the relation which the death of Christ bears to our forgiveness, as more readily admitting and suggesting the idea of worth or compensation; but I have not strictly adhered to this distinction.

I have studied to avoid entering upon any question which did not immediately affect the subject

* *Familiar Illustration*, p. 64. And Mr Graham's Letters, p. 75. *Note*.

subject in debate, and to express my arguments as concisely as I could, without being unintelligible. I do not mean to enter upon a full discussion of all that respects the doctrine of atonement; my design is only to prove that it is a doctrine of divine revelation. Much might be said, and that of considerable importance, upon this subject, which I have wholly omitted; contenting myself with a brief, and yet, I hope, sufficient answer to the principal objections made against the doctrine I have attempted to defend. What I have written is from a full persuasion of the truth and importance of this doctrine; but I shall be ready, I trust, to correct any errors I have fallen into, when they are pointed out to me.

I wish the reader every spiritual blessing that is offered to sinners through Jesus Christ, *who is made of God to all that believe wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.*

A SHORT

C
in
w
is
er
ac
fla
wa
ca
wi
do
do
be
ho
m
Bu
by
G
is

A

SHORT DEFENCE

OF THE

DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

THE doctrines which relate to the character and offices of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, are undoubtedly of very great importance in the system of Christianity; and their connection with our religious conduct is so intimate, that it is impossible we should be right in the latter, if we err considerably with respect to the former. The acknowledgement of the divinity of Christ, for instance, calls for such affections and behaviour towards him, as they who look upon him as a mere man cannot maintain. Our practical regard must likewise be much affected by our belief or disbelief of the doctrine of atonement for sin by his death. If this doctrine is without foundation in scripture, it must be a high affront to the Divine Majesty, to place any hope of pardon on the cruel treatment, which a mere man like ourselves met with in the world: But if our Lord Jesus Christ made a sacrifice for sin by his death, and we are commanded to come unto God through such a mediator, then their condition is dangerous indeed, who despise that sacrifice, and

reject that method of approaching God, which is appointed in the gospel for guilty sinners.

The doctrine of atonement has been treated with much contempt by some late writers, who have thought fit to speak (as one of them expresses) "with great indignation" against it; and to represent it, not only as contrary to the scriptures, but likewise as so absurd in itself, that it would render the Bible indefensible, if it contained such a doctrine. I have examined, with some attention, the arguments on which this representation is founded; and as they appear to me to be inconclusive, I have ventured to point out wherein I think them faulty, and to give a short defence of what I believe to be a fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

The doctrine of the Socinians respecting atonement is this, "That God requires no consideration or condition of pardon, but the repentance of the offender; and that, consequently, the death of Christ was no *real* sacrifice for sin, but is called so in the scriptures, merely in a *figurative* sense, by way of allusion to the Jewish sin-offerings; as our praises and other good works are called sacrifices, because they are something *offered up* to God." On the contrary, the doctrine which I mean to defend is, 'That God has thought fit to require a consideration of pardon distinct from the repentance of the sinner; and that this consideration is the death of Christ, which was a real sacrifice for sin, and stood related to the Jewish sacrifice as the antitype to the type.'

I. It is evident, that the inspired writers do speak of the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin. *Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*
 Heb.

Heb. ix. 26. *Christ hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God.* Eph. v. 2. *Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.* Heb. ix. 28. *He is the propitiation for our sins.* 1 John, ii. 2. *After he had offered one sacrifice for sin, he for ever sat down at the right hand of God.* Heb. x. 12. *By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.* Ib. 14. &c. The question then is, Whether this language, which abounds in the New Testament, is proper, and to be understood literally, or merely figurative, and used by way of allusion to the Jewish sacrifices?

It is an allowed rule of interpreting the scriptures, that every doctrine contained therein must be understood in its most plain and obvious sense, considered in connection with its context, unless this sense is clearly absurd in itself, or contrary to other parts of scripture. Now it is self-evidently right, that God should appoint such a way of extending mercy to penitent sinners as his infinite wisdom saw the fittest to display his hatred of sin, and to maintain the honour of his righteous laws, and just government of the universe. And no good reason can be given, why God, as governor of the world, might not appoint a sacrifice to be the means of forgiveness for transgressions against his general laws, as he did for offences against those particular laws, which he instituted as governor of one nation.

Let us then examine whether other parts of scripture require us to restrain the sacrificial language, used concerning our Lord, to a merely figurative sense, or whether we are led by them to understand it in its most proper and obvious signification.

The most striking circumstance of the Jewish oeconomy was, the appointment of sacrifice as the means

means of obtaining pardon for offences committed against that constitution which the Jews were under as a peculiar people. Sacrifice was undoubtedly a consideration distinct from the moral character of the offender, yet was the standing means of obtaining forgiveness, under the Mosaic dispensation, to those who conformed to the conditions required by the ceremonial law.

Now if this dispensation was designed to represent that of the gospel, then is pardon granted under the gospel also, to those who comply with the conditions required therein, by virtue of a consideration distinct from the moral character of the offender, in the same manner as it was under the law of Moses.

That the Jewish propitiatory sacrifices were a necessary consideration of forgiveness, and the means of obtaining it, appears both from their institution, and the view which is given of them by the inspired writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. The words of the institution are plain to this purpose. *And it shall be when any one shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing; And he shall bring his trespass-offering unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him.* Lev. v. 5, 6, 10. This passage, compared with Lev. xvii. 11. which assures us that *it was the blood which made the atonement*, leaves no reason to doubt, that the sacrifice offered by the offender was the appointed means of obtaining forgiveness of his offence.

The same view of propitiatory sacrifices is given in the epistle to the Hebrews, when it is said, *Almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission*, chap. ix. 22.

which

which proves that the sacrifice was looked upon as the consideration on which the pardon was granted. Now if it can be shewn, that these sacrifices were intended to point out the nature of Christ's sacrifice, or the relation which his death bears to the remission of our sins, then it will follow, that the death of Christ is the *consideration* of our forgiveness, with respect to transgressions of the moral law, as the Jewish sacrifices were the consideration of their forgiveness, with respect to transgressions of the ceremonial and political law; and, consequently, that our Lord offered a real sacrifice for sin, *when he offered up himself.*

That the rites of the ceremonial law were intended to represent the manner of our redemption by Christ, is, I think, put beyond all doubt in the epistle to the Hebrews. For, not to mention here the many instances in which our redemption corresponds with those legal rites, as enumerated in that epistle, from whence one might reasonably infer a *designed* representation; we are expressly told, that *the law had a shadow of good things to come*, chap. x. 1. Not a shadow *compared with* those things, (which is undoubtedly true, though not the truth here intended) for that might have been said of any thing unsubstantial, though it had not the least resemblance of them, and is a very different expression from that of the apostle: His words plainly intimate a resemblance; for he adds, *and not the very image of the things*, which words convey no meaning unless we suppose him to be speaking of a resemblance.* The whole sentence points out

* " By a *shadow*, I apprehend, is not meant, that the whole apparatus of the Jewish tabernacle and temple, was typical of the gospel scheme. Throughout the epistle to " the

out the imperfection of that similitude, which the legal rites afforded of good things to come, by a metaphor taken from the art of painting; the former exhibited but the sketch or outlines, and not a finished portrait or complete picture of the latter.† The apostle uses the term *shadow* in another place, in conjunction with a word which likewise fixes its meaning; *The priests that offer gifts according to the law serve unto the* EXAMPLE and SHADOW of heavenly things, chap. viii. 4, 5. The same inspired writer says, *Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the* FIGURES of the true, chap. ix. 24. which expresses, with sufficient clearness, the typical nature of the ceremonial law; and that no doubt might remain of the *intention* to prefigure by these rites, he informs us, that the first tabernacle was a *figure* FOR THE TIME THEN PRESENT, ver. 9. which could not have been said of it, had it not been intended to prefigure things then future. But the evidence of this matter is not yet exhausted; for we are farther assured, that this prefiguration was designed by God himself; for the Apostle, speaking of the high-priest entering into the holy of

“ the Hebrews, the two schemes of Moses and Christ are
 “ compared, and the preference given, as in justice due, to
 “ the latter.-- But the Apostle never once intimates, that the
 “ one dispensation was a type of the other. All he says is,
 “ that the religious system of the Jewish legislator, when
 “ compared with the nobler one of Christ, is no more than
 “ a shadow compared with the substance.” Mr Graham’s
 sermon, intitled, *Repentance, the only Condition of final Ac-*
ceptance, p. 9.

† St Paul uses the same form of speech in his epistle to the Colossians; wherein, speaking of the ceremonial ordinances from which Christians are delivered, he says, *Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.* Chap. ii. 17.

of holies but once a year, adds the reason of it in these plain words, **THE HOLY GHOST THIS SIGNIFY-
ING**, *that the way unto the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet stand-
ing*, chap. ix. 8. And we are also informed, that Moses was instructed concerning the typical nature of the ceremonial law by a divine admonition, *The priests that offer gifts according to the law—serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things*, **AS MOSES WAS ADMONISHED OF GOD WHEN HE WAS ABOUT TO MAKE THE TABERNACLE**, chap. viii. 5. Thus the doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of Christ is demonstrated to be a doctrine of divine revelation; for no terms can be found in language more clear and express, than those which are used to declare the typical nature of the ceremonial law.

II. I might here conclude the positive proof of the doctrine I am defending; but as the *priesthood* and *sacrifice* of Christ are largely treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, and we have, therefore, a good opportunity of learning, whether the inspired writer uses these terms in the *proper* or *figurative* sense, I shall take notice of some of the principal passages which serve to fix their meaning.

The Apostle defines, with great perspicuity, the term *priest* in its proper sense. A priest is one who *is ordained for men, in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin*, Heb. v. 1. But the description which is given of our Lord's priesthood agrees with this: *Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of*
the

the people, chap. ii. 17. And therefore, our Lord is a real and proper high-priest, because he has the essential characters of one. To this office he was solemnly instituted by God; for *as no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron: So also, Christ glorified not himself to be made an high-priest; but he that said unto him—Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec, ver. 45.*

The reality of Christ's priesthood is likewise ascertained by the declaration, that it was *after the order of Melchizedec*, who was, in the most proper sense of the words, *priest of the Most High God*; for if our Lord's priesthood was after his order, it was also real, and not figurative.

The Apostle, speaking of the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, and of its giving way to the priesthood of Christ, says, *The priesthood being changed, there is made, OF NECESSITY, a change also of the law, chap. vii. 12.* Now this argument requires, that Christ be a true high-priest, otherwise there was no need that the law should be changed; for there were figurative priests under the law, as well as at any other period, that is, persons who offered the *spiritual sacrifices* of prayer and thanksgiving unto God; nay, the whole Jewish nation is called, in this sense, a *kingdom of priests*, Ex. xix. 6. and, therefore, the Apostle could never have argued a change of the law from Christ's priesthood, had it not been a real one.

Our Lord is represented as being a more excellent priest than those of the order of Aaron, in that he was ordained to the office with an oath; *Those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath, by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will*

will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec, chap. vii. 12. But if Christ is only called a priest, because he devoted his life to the service of God, and died in defence of his doctrine; to talk of his superior dignity, in being constituted a priest with an oath, is to make a mere jingie of sounds without a meaning.

The superior dignity of our Lord as a priest is likewise argued from other particulars, which prove his priesthood to be real, and not metaphorical: As that he excelled the high-priests under the law, in having no occasion to offer up a sacrifice for his own sins, but only for those of the people. *Such an high-priest became us,—who needed not daily, as those high-priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once, when he offered up himself. For the law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore*, chap. vii. 27, 28.* Now, if Christ did not properly offer any sacrifice for the sins of the people, what can the inspired writer mean by informing us, that he excelled the Jewish high-priests in not offering one for himself? The argument is important, and conclusive, if we consider the death of Christ as a *real* sacrifice for sin; on any other supposition, the reasoning is childish.

The *sacrifice*, which this great high-priest of our profession offered up for us, was *himself*. This sacrifice, the apostle informs us, excelled in its expiatory virtue those which were offered under the law, and therefore we are assured that it was a proper one. If the death of Christ has no influence in procuring the remission of our sins, but as it leads us to repent

B

of

* See also chap. v. 1, 2, 3.

of them, then it has no expiatory virtue at all, but only a tendency to promote that which properly expiates our guilt. But the apostle's reasoning does by no means agree with this sentiment: He says, "If the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; HOW MUCH MORE shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God," chap. ix. 13, 14. It is not good sense to talk of the greater comparative efficacy of a sacrifice, which, as a sacrifice, has no efficacy at all: nor could it with any propriety be said, that if the blood of bulls was sufficient to purify the flesh, then the blood of Christ was *much more* sufficient to purge the conscience, unless the efficacy of the latter were of the same kind as that of the former.

When the apostle would point out the dangerous condition of those who reject the Lord Jesus as their Saviour, or, in his own emphatical language, *who tread under foot the Son of God*; he does it by reminding us, that there is no other sacrifice for sin than that which our Lord made by his death. *If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin*, chap. x. 26. Now, if Christ made no sacrifice for sin by his death, it is a strange kind of reasoning, to tell us there is no other: And if the term be applied to the death of Christ only by way of metaphor, then the assertion is false; for there have been many besides our Lord, who have offered their lives in the cause of truth, and for the good of mankind, which is all that the figurative use of the term implies.

When the inspired writers inform us, that some of the circumstances of our Lord's death happened through

through an *intention* to conform to particular Jewish institutions, they thereby assure us, that they did not compare the death of Christ to those institutions merely by way of allusion, in order to reconcile mankind to the notion of a suffering Saviour. For then the conformity would have been imaginary, or accidental, which is inconsistent with an intentional one. But, on the other hand, an intentional conformity was necessary on this supposition, (and on this only) that those institutions were designed to be typical, and, therefore, an assurance of such a conformity strongly intimates that they were so. *The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high-priest for sin, are burnt without the camp. WHEREFORE Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate,* Heb. xiii. 11, 12. See likewise John xix. 36.

III. Before I proceed to answer the particular objections made to the doctrine of atonement, I will consider it in another point of view, from whence we may likewise discern that it is founded on divine revelation.

If Christ died only to confirm his doctrine, and to give us an example of patient submission to the will of God, then there is nothing different in the nature or design of his death, from that of any other teacher of Christianity, who suffered in defence of what he taught. Paul and Peter, and all the martyred Christian teachers, died *for* us just in the same sense as Christ died for us: * But this is inconsistent with the scriptural account of Christ's death.

St

* " The circumstantial account of the sufferings and death of Christ, in the 53d chapter of Isaiah, might have been the description of any other good man in the same situation, with this only difference, that the moral effects of it are represented to be more extensive." *Theological Repository*, vol. I. p. 129.

St Paul, reproving the Corinthians for their contentious behaviour in opposing the principal teachers of Christianity to one another, and to Christ, endeavours to rectify their conduct, by informing them, that they were to look upon all the ministers of the gospel as standing in the same relation to them. *It hath been declared unto me, says he, that there are contentions among you—that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ, 1 Cor. i. 11, 12. Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? chap. iii. 5.* Whereas he rejects with abhorrence the thought of their being considered as standing in the same relation to them as Christ did. *Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?* The apostle could not mean in this passage, to make a question whether he himself had been put to death, or to assert, that if he died in defence of his doctrine, it would not be for their benefit; for he speaks elsewhere of being *offered up on the sacrifice and service of their faith*; but he evidently means to point out the difference of that relation in which Christ, and that in which their other spiritual teachers stood towards them; and gives this as a proof of such difference, that *Christ died FOR them*. Now, if Christ had only died *for* them, in the same sense that Stephen and others had already done, and that he himself shortly was to do, to say that Christ *died FOR them*, was giving no proof that he stood in relation to them distinct from that of other teachers of the gospel.

The apostle, in other passages, insists upon the particular relation which Christ bears to us, different from that of all other teachers of Christianity. As in 2 Cor. iv. 5. *We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus*

Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. If Christ was but a mere teacher of God's will, it will be difficult to make such declarations consistent with truth; for in that case, the apostles preached themselves as much as they preached Christ: And it will not be easy to find a good reason, why one preacher of the gospel should call himself the servant of those to whom he preaches, for the sake of another person, who was simply a teacher like himself.

The scriptures constantly represent the death of Christ as having a peculiar respect to our forgiveness and reconciliation with God, and this is expressed in a variety of phrases. We are said to be *justified by his blood*,—*reconciled to God by his death*,—to have *redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin*,—to be *perfected through his offering*, &c. Yet not one word is spoken concerning any such relation which the death of the martyrs bears to us, altho' frequent and honourable mention is made of them. St Stephen and St James had suffered death in defence of Christianity, as well as our Lord, before the writings of the New Testament were finished; and a very particular account is given of the behaviour and sufferings of the former, who, according to the Socinian scheme, gave himself a sacrifice for us, precisely in the same sense as Christ did; yet we have not the least intimation that any were *justified by the blood of Stephen*, or that he *bore our sins in his own body*, and *made reconciliation for us*: Nothing like this appears in the whole New Testament; we are only commanded to be followers of their faith and patience. In the book of the Revelation by St John, the whole body of Christian martyrs is represented as assembled together; many of these, without doubt,

had been brought to repentance by the preaching and good example of others ; and, therefore, according to the doctrine of Socinus, must have been justified by their blood ; but nothing like this sentiment appears ; on the contrary, they are all said to have *washed their robes, and made them white in the BLOOD OF THE LAMB*, and on that account to be before the throne of God, Rev. vii. 14, 15. They, and all the rest who attain eternal felicity, ascribe their salvation to the Lamb, the influence of whose death is declared to be of universal extent. “ They
 “ sung a new song, saying—Thou wast slain, and
 “ hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of
 “ every kindred, and tongue, and people, and na-
 “ tion,” chap. v. 9.

Again, If the death and resurrection of Christ are only to be considered as motives to our repentance, they could never have been declared in holy writ to be *necessary* for the remission of sins : for, if the remission of our sins flows merely from the mercy of God, without respect to any other consideration than our repentance, then nothing else is *necessary* to our forgiveness. * Yet St Paul says, *If Christ be not raised* (and, consequently, if he has not died,) *ye are yet in your sins*, 1 Cor. xv. 17. Now, the Apostle could not have argued thus, if nothing but repentance was necessary to their forgiveness. He might, indeed, have said, as he does in the preceding verses, *If Christ be not risen,—we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God, that he raised up Christ :*

* “ It is only necessary,” (in order to understand how we are justified *through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.*) “ to suppose that our redemption, or deliverance from the
 “ power of sin, *i. e.* our repentance and reformation, with-
 “ out which there is no promise of pardon, is promoted by the
 “ gospel of Jesus Christ.” *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

Christ : but he could not add, that the remission of their sins was affected by the failure of this consideration, if no such consideration was necessary to that remission. On the contrary, if *Christ* be considered as our high-priest, appointed to offer a sacrifice for sins, and to rise again that he might enter the holiest with his own blood, there *to appear in the presence of God for us*, then there is some propriety in the assertion, that if *Christ* be not raised we are yet in our sins; because the want of his resurrection would prove that he had failed in the execution of his office, and, consequently, that his sacrifice was insufficient to make atonement for transgressions.

Lastly, If forgiveness is granted to penitent sinners without any respect to the death of *Christ*, we ought to have no respect to it in asking forgiveness at the hands of God. But if we are commanded to come to God through the Lord Jesus *Christ*, and our views are directed to his mediation while we implore the divine favour, then is pardon granted with a respect to his mediation.*

We are commanded to pray *in the name of Christ*, which surely intimates, that we ought to have a regard to him in our addresses to God. *Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son*, John xiv. 13. It is allowed that this is one of the peculiarities of Christianity; but to pray with the temper of *Christ*, as some interpret the expression, is no *peculiarity* of Christianity, for even natural religion teaches us, that we should worship God with reverence, love, and submission; which is all, I suppose, that is meant by the *mind of Christ*.

* “ When David, and other penitents, confess their sins, and intreat for pardon, they refer themselves to the divine mercy only, without seeming to have the least idea of any thing farther.” *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

Christ. If any one should imagine, it is praying in the name of Christ, to say *through Jesus Christ our Lord* at the end of our prayers, without meaning any thing by those words, with such an one, I apprehend, it would be needless to argue.

The peculiar regard which is due to Christ in our approaches to God, is clearly intimated in the first epistle to Timothy. The apostle, after exhorting that *supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men*, adds, *For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*, chap. ii. 5. Now, if by a *mediator* is only meant one who declares the mind of God to mankind, then there are as many mediators as there are inspired teachers of religion.* But the manner in which the apostle expresses himself shews that Christ is our mediator in a sense peculiar to himself, and the context leads us to understand the term in its most common acceptation, as expressive of one who treats with God on our behalf, as well as with us on the behalf of God.

It may be objected, that Moses is called a *mediator*, Gal. iii. 19. and, therefore, that it cannot be proved from the application of this title to Christ, that he stands in any relation to us different from that in which Moses stood to the people of Israel. In answer

* "A mediator, in the sense of sacred scripture, is one between God and the people; who declares to them the mind of God, denounces judgements upon the disobedient, and proclaims pardon to penitent characters; and there being only two authentic revelations from heaven to our world, of course, we read only of *two mediators*, employed to communicate the same to the people; and if there was to be a third revelation, there would also be occasion for a third mediator," &c. See Mr Graham's sermon, before quoted, p. 8.

swer to this I would observe, that Christ is not merely called *a mediator* in this passage, but the *ONE mediator between God and men*; a form of speech very different from that made use of with respect to Moses. Moses is likewise called *a god*, but surely the apostle's solemn declaration that there is but *ONE God* would shew, that the title is applied to him in an inferior sense, though the unity of God were taught in no other part of the Bible. And since our Lord is styled the *ONE mediator* in such a connection, we may with equal propriety conclude, that he is our mediator in a sense which can be attributed to no other person.

The author of the epistle to the Hebrews expressly founds our boldness in addressing the throne of grace upon the presence of our compassionate high-priest in heaven; which proves that respect is due to him in those addresses. *Seeing then that we have a great high-priest, that is passed unto the heavens, Jesus the Son of God—let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, chap. iv. 14, 16. And again in chap. x. 19—22. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say, his flesh; and having an high-priest over the house of God: let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, &c.*

St. John encourages the true christian to hope for pardon from the consideration that he has a powerful advocate with the Father, who is the propitiation for his sins. *My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not: And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our*

our sins, 1 John ii. 1, 2. The apostle, in this passage, is evidently attempting to remove the discouragements with which sincere christians may be afflicted, under a sense of the manifold defects of their obedience; and the argument he proposes for his purpose is expressed in terms so plain, that no subtilty of criticism, one would think, could ever set aside the obvious sense of it: The different parts of this passage fix the meaning of the principal terms in such a manner, that to alter them from their most obvious signification, is to render the whole sentence obscure or unintelligible. For should it be said, that the word here rendered *advocate* sometimes signifies *a comforter*, the expression *with the Father* shews that it cannot mean so in this place. Our Lord promised that he would send the Holy Ghost to reside as a comforter *with all his true disciples*, but to tell such that if they sin they have *a comforter with the Father*, is, in my apprehension, to talk unintelligibly. But the following verse clearly determines the sense of the passage; for this assures us, that Christ is our *advocate with the Father*, as being the *propitiation for our sins*, and therefore he is here very emphatically styled *Jesus Christ THE RIGHTEOUS* *

Such

* Mr Graham says, in his letters, p. 45. that "the Greek word *ιασμος*," (propitiation) "is never used by the sacred writers in the sense of rendering God propitious." The word *εξιλασχομαι* is perpetually used in the Septuagint for *making atonement*, in conformity to which sense of the word, the phrase *ιασμος περι των αμαρτιων ημων*, which is twice applied to our Lord in St John's first epistle, cannot be more justly translated than by *the propitiation*, or *propitiatory sacrifice for our sins*. In the epistle to the Hebrews also, Christ is said to have become our high-priest. *ως το ιλασθαι της αμαρτιας του λαου*, to *expiate*, or *make reconciliation for the sins of the people*, chap. ii. 17. So that whatever is meant by *making atonement*, thus much

Such are the instructions given to penitent believers in the gospel, and in them we may discern both the truth and importance of the doctrine of atonement for sin by the death of Christ. Were the Socinian hypothesis true, such directions could have no place in the inspired writings, since they are subversive of what that system accounts the true gospel of Christ.

IV. Let us now take a view of the principal objections made to the doctrine of atonement, and consider whether they are sufficient to overturn the arguments proposed in defence of it.

1. The author of the *Appeal* asserts,* that it is impossible to reconcile this doctrine with those scriptures, which speak of our being justified *freely* by the grace of God, and that “ the declarations of divine
“ mercy to the penitent are all absolute, without
“ the most distant hint of their having any refer-
“ ence to any consideration on which they are made,
“ as Psalm lxxxvi. 5. Dan. ix. 3.”†

It

much is evident, that Christ is *that* with respect to the remission of our transgressions of the moral law, which the Jewish propitiatory sacrifices were with respect to the transgressions of the ceremonial law.

* P. 18.

The arguments which our author has urged against the doctrine of atonement in his *Appeal*, *Triumph of Truth*, and *Familiar Illustration*, he has treated rather more diffusely in his *Essay on the proper end of the death of Christ*, contained in the first volume of the *Theological Repository*. But as the three former tracts are our author's latest publications on the subject, if I mistake not, and as in them his sentiments are expressed with more conciseness than in the *Theological Repository*, I have only referred to the latter with respect to those arguments which are not contained in the former. Indeed, I did not know that all the above mentioned treatises were composed by the same author, until I had written a considerable part of this defence.

† *Triumph of Truth*, p. 20.

It is granted, there are in the scriptures many declarations of mercy, which do not mention an atonement as the consideration on which pardon is granted; there are likewise many, which neither mention an atonement nor repentance itself; but it will not follow from thence, that either the one or the other is unnecessary. If we desire to know the whole counsel of God respecting us, we must take into consideration the whole of divine revelation; and I submit it to the candid reader to determine from the scriptures already quoted, whether there are not some declarations of divine mercy to the penitent, which contain more than a distant hint of a consideration of pardon distinct from our own penitence. If pardon is granted to all who come unto God through Jesus Christ in the way he has appointed, that pardon is certainly as *free* with respect to us, as if there were no mediator between God and man; and the Antinomian, who asserts there is no condition of pardon required of us, is as much supported in his opinion by the declarations of *free-grace*, as the Socinian, who asserts there was no condition performed by our Mediator. The inspired writers of the New Testament saw no more contradiction between the freeness of God's grace, and the propitiation made by the death of Christ, than the rest of the Jews did between the goodness of God in remitting their offences against the ceremonial law, and the efficacy of those sacrifices, which were the appointed consideration of that remission; or than the Socinians do between free-grace, and the necessity of repentance as the condition of pardon. That remarkable passage in Rom. iii. is so full to this purpose, that if there were no other in the Bible, it is sufficient to determine this matter. "For all have sinned, and come
 " short

“ short of the glory of God ; being justified freely
 “ by his grace, through the redemption that is in
 “ Jesus Christ : whom God hath set forth to be a
 “ propitiation, through faith in his blood, to de-
 “ clare his righteousness for the remission of sins
 “ that are past, through the forbearance of God, to
 “ declare, I say, at this time his righteousness ; that
 “ he might be just, and the justifier of him that be-
 “ lieveth in Jesus.” ver. 23--26. The apostle, in this
 passage, treats expressly on the method of our justi-
 fication before God, which he affirms to be *through*
the redemption that is in Jesus Christ ; and he like-
 wise points out the reason of this method, *that the*
righteousness of God might be declared, or demon-
 strated ; that he might appear to be just whilst
 he justifies the believer in Jesus. Here we have the
 whole doctrine of atonement concisely delivered to
 us, and all attempts to take off the force of this scrip-
 ture, as a proof of that doctrine, destroy the antithe-
 sis which is evident in the passage, and, in my opi-
 nion, make the apostle’s arguing to be flat and trif-
 ling. The *forbearance* of God in the remission of sins
 that are past is opposed to his *righteousness*, which is
 said to be *declared* by this method of forgiveness ; and
 this opposition is a principal branch of the apostle’s
 argument, for he repeats and lays a particular stress
 upon it, *to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness,*
that he might be just, and the justifier of him that be-
*lieveth in Jesus.** Our author, and others, who by
 C the

* The author of the *Illustration* tells us, that the word here
 rendered *propitiation*, ought to have been translated *mercy-seat* ;
 but he does not extend his criticism on the translation to the
 whole of the passage. Though I think the translation of this
 text sufficiently accurate to shew, that the scope of the apostle’s
 arguing is inconsistent with a denial of the doctrine of atone-
 ment ;

the *righteousness* or *justice* of God mentioned here, would have us understand his *goodness* or *mercy*, must give some good reason for such an interpretation before it can be admitted; as the inspired writer himself, in this very epistle, makes a distinction between the terms *righteous* and *good*. Scarcely for a RIGHTEOUS (or just) man will one die; yet peradventure for a GOOD man some would even dare to die, chap. v. 7. When the apostle, in the context to the passage above quoted, declares that we are justified by faith, and not by the works of the law, I cannot suppose, as our author does,* that he only “intended “to oppose the doctrine of the Jews, who maintained that the observance of the law of Moses was “absolutely necessary to salvation;” because it is added,

ment; yet, in my opinion, the original sets this in a much stronger light than the English translation, which does not clearly express the sense of that very material sentence in the passage, *δια τῆν παρῆσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων*, which I should imagine might with more propriety be rendered, *because, or on account of the passing by of sins committed aforetime*. The 25th and 26th verses ought, I think, to be translated in some such way as this; *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory (or mercy-seat) through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of his righteousness, because of the passing by of sins committed aforetime, through the forbearance of God: For a demonstration, I say, of his righteousness at this period, that he might be just, &c.* The sense of the apostle will then appear to be, That God, in setting forth Christ as our propitiatory or mercy-seat, by whom we have access to God through faith in his blood, hath given at length the most clear demonstration of his righteousness or justice, which might appear to have been obscured by his having hitherto, in his great long suffering, passed by the sins of men, without affording a sufficient display of his hatred to sin, or such a display as is now made by the manifestation of our Redeemer. See a farther illustration of this passage, in a book intitled *Jesus Christ the Mediator*, &c. p. 85.

* *Illustration*, p. 54.

added, *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.* Which words can only be spoken of the moral law; for the apostle did not establish the law of Moses by preaching faith in Christ: On the contrary, he made it void, or declared it to be abrogated. Whereas, the moral law is established by this doctrine; its justice being most clearly shewn by the propitiation made for our transgressions of it, and obedience most effectually secured by a true faith in Christ Jesus.

2. “ Can we wish for a more distinct, and perfect representation of the manner in which God forgives the sins of his offspring of mankind, than our Saviour has exhibited to us in the parable of the *prodigal son*.” *Appeal*, p. 19.

The design of this parable, as the context shews, was to reprove the Jews for their unreasonable conduct, in objecting to our Lord’s most gracious attention to notorious sinners, and his kind reception of such upon their repentance; and to teach us with what kindness we ought to behave to all repenting sinners, when they return to the path of duty, however profligate their former conduct may have been. But whether the doctrine of atonement be true or false, cannot be determined from this parable, as the apparent design of it has nothing to do with this question. The parable proves that God is merciful; and I should suppose, that the appointment of a way, whereby sinners may obtain forgiveness from his hands, does not infer that he is unmerciful. Expositors of scripture should be very cautious of deducing any doctrine from a parabolic representation, but what appears to be designedly enforced by that representation: without this caution the most absurd opinions may be, and, indeed, too often have been, urged from these parts of holy writ.

3. “ To

3. " To say that God the Father provided an
 " atonement for his own-offended justice is, in fact,
 " to give up the doctrine. If a person owe me a
 " sum of money, and I chuse to have the debt dis-
 " charged, is it not the same thing whether I remit
 " the debt at once, or supply him with money
 " wherewith to pay me?" *Triumph of Truth*, p. 21.

This argument is founded upon these suppositions, that our sins bear no other relation to God than that of debts to a creditor, and that to make atonement for sin is the same kind of transaction as to pay a debt; but till these suppositions are either allowed or proved, no argument can be grounded upon them. As obedience is something that we owe to God, our failures herein are sometimes, with great propriety, called *debts* in the scriptures. But it is very evident, that the sacred writings do not only represent God as our *creditor*, but likewise as our *moral governor*: And it must be acknowledged by every reasonable person, that as he alone is acquainted with all the ends aimed at in the punishment of sinners, he is the sole judge of the propriety of it in any case, and of the considerations or conditions proper to be required in order to the remission of our sins.

4. " It can never be reconciled to equity, or answer any good purpose whatever, to make the
 " innocent suffer the punishment of the guilty." *Ib.*

Nothing can be plainer, both from scripture and experience, than that many suffer for the sins of others; and this is undoubtedly by the appointment of God, if he is the governor and judge of all the earth. Whether the appointment be equitable or not, I leave our author to judge for himself; the fact he does not deny. " It is allowed," says he, " that we
 " suffer by the sin of Adam, as any child may suffer
 " in

“ in consequence of the wickedness of his ancestor.”* And if these sufferings are inflicted by God, acting the part of a judge, they are consequently *penal*. These considerations afford a sufficient answer to any charge of injustice respecting the sufferings of Christ; but, in truth, there is not the least foundation for such a charge in this case; for the doctrine of atonement supposes, that the undertaking of our Redeemer to suffer for our sins was perfectly voluntary, and that he had full power over himself when he undertook the work of man’s redemption.

5. “ If it had been inconsistent with the divine justice to pardon sin upon repentance only, without some farther satisfaction, we might have expected to have found it *expressly said to be so* in the scriptures; but no such declaration can be produced either from the Old or New Testament. All that can be pretended is, that it may be *inferred* from it.” lb.

Whatever doctrine may be fairly *inferred* from scripture, demands our assent and practical regard, as much as if it was therein *expressly declared*; nor have we the least right to find fault with the manner in which any truth is made known to us, or to pay the less attention to it on that account.

When our Lord argued with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, he chose to make use of a passage in the Old Testament, which proved this important truth only in a way of inference: And if he thought such a method of reasoning to be conclusive, we have sufficient authority to think so too. The declarations of scripture respecting the doctrine of atonement are, in my opinion, neither few nor obscure;

scure ;* but of this the reader must judge, when he has considered the passages quoted in defence of this doctrine, and others which I have taken notice of, that are contained in the sacred scriptures.

6. " Though good works are recommended to us in the strongest manner, it is never with any salvo or caution, as if they were not *of themselves* acceptable to God." Ib.

If our good works are *of themselves* acceptable to God, in the most strict sense of the word, without any reference to the mediation of Christ, what do the scriptures mean by telling us that they are *acceptable through Jesus Christ*? *Ye are an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices* ACCEPTABLE TO GOD THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, 1 Pet. ii.

5. BY HIM, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, Heb. xiii. 15. The phrases *by Christ*, and *acceptable through Christ*, cannot mean, that our good works, or *spiritual sacrifices*, are to be done in the temper, or after the conduct of Christ, for that is included in the very notion of their being good. We can offer no spiritual sacrifice to God, *i. e.* no true homage or service, but in the temper of Christ: for the *mind of Christ* means nothing more than an humble, thankful, holy mind; and the *conduct of Christ* is only another expression for a righteous conduct: so that, according to the Socinian doctrine, all that can be meant by a command

* Mr. Graham differs widely from this opinion, for he says, " There is not a single text in all the New Testament, as far as I can remember, that can, by any rules of just and sober criticism, be retained in support of it," (the doctrine of atonement). " There are only two that seem to look that way, viz. Matt. xx. 28. *He gave his life a ransom for many*; and 1 Tim. ii. 6. *He gave himself a ransom for all.*" Letters on the atonement, p. 34.

mand to offer our spiritual sacrifices *through Christ* is, that when we are thankful to God we must be thankful to him, and when we praise him, we must give him praise.

To what I have before said on this subject of access to God through Jesus Christ, I would here add, that *holy* persons are represented in scripture as standing in need of the blood of Christ to cleanse them from sin. *If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his son cleanseth us from all sin,* 1 John i. 6, 7. By *walking in the light* is undoubtedly meant, living in the true knowledge and fear of God; and to such the assurance is given, that the blood of Christ cleanseth them from all sin. Now, if the blood of Christ bears no other relation to the forgiveness of sin, than that of any martyr who dies in the defence of the truth,* with what propriety can such a declaration, as this text contains, be made to those who are already in the favour of God? To make this reasoning the more clear, let us suppose, that one who
saw

* "Christ being a man, who suffered and died in the best of causes, there is nothing so very different in the occasion or manner of his death; from that of others who suffered and died after him in the cause of christianity, but that their sufferings and deaths may be considered in the same light with his." Theological Repository, vol. I. p. 39.

The texts brought to prove this sentiment are 2 Cor. i. 5. Col. i. 24. Phil. iii. 10. 1 Pet. iv. 13. Matt. xx. 23. When the sufferings which the persecuted disciples of Christ undergo for righteousness sake are called the *sufferings of Christ*, the expression is undoubtedly figurative, and the reasons for such a figure are very obvious, without supposing, that the sufferings of Christ bear the same relation to the forgiveness of sin, as those of any persecuted christian.

saw the martyr Stephen stoned to death, should have been induced by his conduct to consider the doctrine which he taught, and thereby to have been turned from a wicked course of life to the service of God. With what propriety could it have been said to such an one, that if he walked in the light, as God is in the light, the blood of Stephen should cleanse him from all sin? Would such language have conveyed any ideas to the Christian convert? Every one, I suppose, will allow, that such an address would have been downright nonsense. And since, upon the Socinian system, the blood of Christ bears the same relation to our forgiveness as the blood of Stephen, we must make the same conclusion with regard to the apostle's language, or believe that Socinianism and Christianity are, in this respect, opposite systems.

7. "If any of the Jews had had the least notion of the necessity of any atonement for the sins of mankind, they could not but have expected a *suffering Messiah*; and yet it is plain that the very best of them had no such idea." Ib. p. 22.

It is equally plain, that the Jews ought to have expected a *suffering Messiah*, their own prophets having clearly foretold his sufferings. *After threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself*, Dan. ix. 26. *He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed, &c.* Isaiah liii. Accordingly the Jews were often reproved for not expecting a suffering Messiah, and, on this account, charged with ignorance of the scriptures. Thus our Lord rebuked the two disciples who were travelling to Emmaus; *O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffer-*

ed

ed
xxi
dis
wh
fille
the
it i
to r
46.
in h
thing
his
fille
Paul
and
voic
day,
xiii.
our
from
evid
did r
8.
" re
" fe
of m
O
the p
spake
his p
* I
gainst
ments
our L
timatio
See T

ed these things, and to enter into his glory? Luke xxiv. 25. And again, he said to the whole body of disciples, *These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me.—Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise again from the dead the third day.* Ib. ver. 44, 46. St Peter made the same declaration to the Jews in his preaching, after our Saviour's death: *Those things which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled,* Acts iii. 18. And in the same manner St Paul addresses them; *They that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him,* chap. xiii. 27. So that the arguments against any part of our Lord's mediatorial character, which are drawn from the ignorance of the Jews respecting it, are evidently invalid, because it appears clearly that they did not know his real character.*

8. "Though our Saviour frequently explains the reason of his coming, and the necessity of his suffering, it is never on any such account," viz. that of making atonement. Ib.

Our Lord appears to have paid some attention to the prejudices of the Jews, in the things which he spake concerning himself; and the chief subjects of his preaching seem to have been those which would lead

* I am quite at a loss how to reconcile this argument against the doctrine of atonement with our author's own sentiments; for he frequently speaks of the ancient predictions of our Lord's sufferings and death, without giving the least intimation that he thinks them either unintelligible or obscure. See Theological Repository, vol. I. p. 129, 341, &c.

lead them to receive him under his proper character, when all things necessary to ascertain that character were accomplished. He taught the truth to his most intimate and faithful disciples in a gradual manner, as they were able to bear it; and professed to them a little before his death, that he still left many things unsaid, which he would afterwards teach them by his Spirit: *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; howbeit, when he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth.—He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you,* John xvi. 12, 13. We ought, therefore, to look for these things in the writings of the apostles; and we may reasonably conclude, that the truths referred to by our Lord were those, which his sufferings and resurrection would make more plain and intelligible. If then we find it declared in the apostolic writings, that one design of our Saviour's death was to make atonement for sin, we have no reason to doubt of the truth of this declaration, though our Lord had not given the least intimation of such a design. But many intimations of this were given during his abode on earth, though it was not taught so explicitly before as after his sufferings. At the first introduction of our Saviour into his ministry, his great herald pointed him out as one who should make atonement for sin: *Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world,* John i. 29.* This was a very uncouth similitude, if Christ took away our sin only by his doctrine and example; for lambs never take away sin in this manner, nor in any other manner but that of expiatory sacri-

* The author of the *Appeal* classes this text amongst those in which Christ is represented as a *sacrifice*. Theological Repository, vol. I. p. 125.

sacrifices; and St Peter intimates, that the death of Christ bore this relation to our redemption: *Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, AS OF A LAMB without blemish and without spot,* 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. †

Our Lord informed his disciples, that he should give his flesh for the life of the world, John vi. 51. And added, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,* ver. 53. This expression is undoubtedly figurative, but the figure is quite unnatural, if Christ died merely as a teacher of divine truth; but if his death is to be considered as a sacrifice, then the figure of feeding upon him is easy and familiar. Knowledge is often represented, in metaphorical language, as the food of the mind; but the expression of feeding upon the teacher himself, merely as a teacher, was probably never heard of. St Paul says, *I have fed you with milk,* i. e. the most plain doctrines of Christianity, and *not with strong meat,* i. e. the more obscure; but he never talks of feeding Christians with his flesh and blood; nor do we find any declarations of St Peter's flesh being *meat indeed*, and his blood *drink indeed*.

When our Lord, at the institution of that ordinance, which was designed to perpetuate the remembrance

† Should any one object, that the redemption here spoken of is from the power of sin, which was not the proper effect of expiatory sacrifices, it should be remembered, that a true faith in Christ, by which we partake of the benefits of his sacrifice, is always attended with holiness of life, and therefore our deliverance from the guilt and power of sin are always supposed to accompany one another, though one of them is often specified alone when our salvation is spoken of in scripture.

membrance of his death, informed us, that his *blood was shed for the remission of sins*, and that *the new covenant was in or through his blood*, he surely gave an intimation, at least, that his death bore the relation of a sacrifice to us, and was the consideration on which our pardon is granted, according to the terms of the new covenant.

9. "When our Saviour describes the proceedings of the day of judgment, he doth not represent the righteous as referring themselves to the sufferings or merit of their judge for their justification; and the judge himself expressly grounds it on their good works only." 1b.

The conclusion which our author means to establish by this argument is, that our justification is not grounded on the sufferings or merit of our judge, but on our good works only. If this is his meaning, and I do not see what else he can mean, he has argued as much against his own doctrine, as against that he opposes; for he tells us in his *Appeal*, p. 18, "That no man who is a sinner (and all men have sinned) can be *justified by his works*. We all stand in need of, and must have recourse to, *free-grace and mercy*." But our Saviour does not represent the righteous as referring themselves at the day of judgment to the free grace and mercy of God for their justification, but expressly grounds it on their good works only; therefore, according to our author's way of arguing, men are not justified by free grace and mercy, but by their works only. The argument, which way soever it is turned, will appear to have no force, when we consider, that the justification at the day of judgment is of a different kind from that about which we are now debating: It is neither grounded on the merits of our judge, nor on free grace, but
on

on good works only, and is what some divines, with great propriety, call a *declarative* justification. We are justified *properly*, or *in the sight of God*, as St. Paul assures us, whenever with a penitent heart we truly believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; and this justification is through the blood of Christ. We are justified *declaratively*, or *in the sight of men*, when we *shew forth our faith by our works*, as St. James speaks. Abraham, for instance, was justified in St. Paul's sense of the word, when he *believed God*; he was justified in St. James's sense, when he *offered up Isaac*. Compare Rom. iv. with James ii. Now, as the design of the last public judgment is not that God may *discover* what men are, in order to regulate his distribution of rewards and punishments, but to *shew* what men are to themselves, and an assembled universe, and to *reveal* his righteous judgment; on which account that awful period is called *the day of the REVELATION of the righteous judgment of God*. Rom. ii. 5; so the justification and condemnation of men, which are then to take place, will be solely founded on that which demonstrates what they really were in their state of probation, namely, their works, taking the word in its most extensive sense. *I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and they were judged every man according to their works.* Rev. xx. 12, 13.

10. " Though St. Peter, in his discourse to the
 " Jews on the day of Pentecost, speaks of their sin
 " in murdering Christ as of a heinous nature, he says
 " not a word of the necessity of any atonement,—
 " but only exhorts to repentance." And " all the
 " discourses of St Paul upon various occasions, in
 " the book of Acts, are intirely moral." Ib.

If it were true, that the apostles did not teach the

doctrine of atonement in any of those few discourses of theirs which are recorded in the book of Acts, this would not afford a presumption, much less a proof that they did not teach it at all. It is evident, that they delivered different truths at different times, and we may safely suppose, that in this they adapted their discourses to the state of their hearers. If we are taught this, or any other doctrine in holy writ, it matters not in what part, or upon what occasion. Let the Lord speak, and it is our duty to believe and obey. But it is not true, that all the discourses of the apostles recorded in the Acts are intirely *moral*, if I understand our author's sense of the word: For St. Paul, after having proved, in his sermon at Antioch, that Jesus was the Christ, and that the Jews had eventually fulfilled all that was written of him, concludes with this application, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And BY HIM all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii. 38, 39. The same apostle gives this solemn admonition to the elders of the church at Ephesus, *take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, WHICH HE HATH PURCHASED WITH HIS OWN BLOOD.* chap. xx. 28. And St. Peter, in his discourse before Cornelius, speaking of Christ, says, *To him give all the prophets witness, that THROUGH HIS NAME, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.* chap. x. 43.

II. "It is particularly remarkable, that when sacrifices under the law are expressly said not to be sufficient for the pardon of sin, we are never referred to any *more availing sacrifice*; but to good works

“ works only.” Ib. Let the reader judge of the propriety of this remark, when he has considered the following passage of scripture. “ The law having a
 “ shadow of good things to come, and not the very
 “ image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offer year by year continually,
 “ make the comers thereunto perfect: for then
 “ would they not have ceased to be offered; because
 “ that the worshippers once purged should have had
 “ no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices
 “ there is a remembrance again made of sins every
 “ year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls
 “ and of goats should take away sin. Wherefore,
 “ when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice
 “ and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast
 “ thou prepared me: In burnt-offerings and sacrifices
 “ for sin thou hast had no pleasure: Then said I, Lo,
 “ I come (in the volume of the book it is written
 “ of me) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he
 “ said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings,
 “ and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst
 “ pleasure therein (which are offered by the law;)
 “ then said he, Lo, I come, to do thy will, O God.
 “ He taketh away the first that he may establish the
 “ second. By the which will we are sanctified,
 “ through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ
 “ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this
 “ man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for
 “ ever sat down on the right hand of God; from
 “ thenceforth expecting till his enemies be made his
 “ footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected
 “ for ever them that are sanctified. Heb. x. 1—14.
 In this passage we are informed, that the sacrifices
 under the law were insufficient to take away sins (in
 the

the proper sense of the word.) and for this, which the blood of bulls and goats could not do, we are referred to a *more availing sacrifice*, the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, which is sufficient to perfect for ever them that are sanctified. So that the reverse of our author's objection is asserted in the plainest terms; and if such authority of holy writ cannot decide the matter, we need not wonder, that it is found difficult to put an end to any controversy by Scripture.

¶ In the *Theological Repository* several texts are produced to prove, that " whenever the legal sacrifices " are declared, by the prophets, to be insufficient to " procure the favour of God, the only thing that is " opposed to them, as of more value in the sight of " God, is personal holiness, good works, or moral " virtue. See Psal. li. 16, 17. Isaiah i. 11—20. " Hos. vi. 6. Amos v. 22—27. Micah vi. 6, 7, " 8."* Vol. I. p. 129.

In order to understand these, and other texts to the same purpose, it is necessary to consider the design of the legal sacrifices, and the relation they bore to the Jewish people. Besides, being a *figure for the time then present* of the great sacrifice, which was to be offered for the sins of the world, they were appointed to remove the effect of those various ceremonial

* In this quotation from the prophet Micah, the 5th verse is omitted, which, in my opinion, directs us to the true meaning of the passage. " O my people, remember now what " Balak king of Moab consulted, and what Balaam the son " of Beor answered him from Shittim unto Gilgal, that ye " may know the righteousness of the Lord. Wherewith " shall I come before the Lord," &c. Balak was not rejected because his sacrifices were not sufficiently rich or numerous, but because he was defective in justice, mercy, and the love of God: And the Jews were put in mind of this, that they might not vainly hope to compensate for their immoral conduct by the number of their expensive offerings.

monial uncleannesses, which prevented those who were defiled by them from all access to God in his public ordinances: * But they could not remove the guilt of any moral offence, considered as such, or free the offender from being obnoxious to the final judgment of God. They *sanctified to the purifying of the flesh*, but could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, Heb. ix. 9. 13. They were instituted likewise as means of freeing the persons who offered them, in the manner prescribed, from the punishment of those civil offences for which the divine lawgiver had not ordained certain death. † They were undoubtedly always sufficient

D 3

cient

* These uncleannesses, however involuntary, and void of moral turpitude, were branches of the ceremonial law, and required an expiatory sacrifice to make atonement, or remove the obligation to punishment from the offender. "If a soul touch any unclean thing,—and it be hidden from him, he also shall be unclean, and guilty,—and he shall bring his trespass-offering," &c. Lev. v. 2, 6. The most ordinary punishment in these cases was exclusion from the public ordinances of God's worship. See Lev. xii. &c.

† God entered into a particular covenant with the people of Israel at Mount Sinai, and there gave them a body of laws for their government as a nation. This consisted of the moral law, or ten commandments, together with a variety of ceremonial rites, and political injunctions. Temporal blessings and curses were the sanction by which this covenant was guarded. For some offences certain death was appointed; for others pardon was granted upon the offering of the appointed sacrifice, for *without shedding of blood there was no remission*. The efficacy of these sacrifices extended no farther than to the averting of those temporal evils, which the transgressors of the law of Moses were exposed to. The Jews, therefore, were under the moral law in two respects: 1st, As being God's general law, which extends to all mankind; and, 2dly, As being part of that particular law which God instituted for that people, of whom he was, in a peculiar sense,

the

cient for those purposes for which they were instituted; and, therefore, when their insufficiency is taken notice of, it is in such cases only as their efficacy was not designed to be extended to; either the removal of moral guilt, or deliverance from death in capital offences. When David was lamenting his adultery and murder, he says, *Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it thee: thou delightest not in burnt-offering: The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, &c.* Psal. li. 16, 17. God did desire sacrifice in every case for which he had appointed it, as is plain even from the words immediately following this quotation; * but this was not such a case, and therefore the Psalmist acknowledges its insufficiency. It is true, he only mentions the sacrifice of *a broken spirit, and a contrite heart* as acceptable to God in this instance; but if he understood his own writings as his inspired commentator, the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, did, he had some respect to that *Priest after the order of Melchizedec*, of whom he elsewhere speaks.

Those passages in the Old Testament which speak with seeming contempt of sacrifices, and other positive

the king and law-giver. Hence a transgression of the moral law by a Jew might be considered in a twofold view. It might be an unpardonable offence against the Sinai covenant, and consequently expose the offender to capital punishment; yet might be forgiven by God as his final judge upon his true repentance, and faith in the Messiah as then revealed. On the contrary, it might be a pardonable crime, and be actually forgiven through the offering of the appointed sacrifice; and yet expose the sinner, if impenitent, to the final judgment of God.

* "Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; built thou the walls of Jerusalem: Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness; with burnt offering, and whole burnt-offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." ver. 18, 19.

tive institutions, were plainly intended to reprove the Jews for thinking to make up for their neglect of moral righteousness, by the abundance of their oblations, &c. for when positive institutions are thus used by the way of commutation for moral obedience, they become an abomination in the sight of God: * Nay, whenever positive precepts really interfere with those of a moral nature, the preference is always to be given to the latter, as our Lord hath shewn in his discourse concerning the sabbath, Mat. xii. On the other hand, it is equally plain, that legal sacrifices were as much insisted upon in their proper place as any duty of moral obligation, and the people were reprov'd by the prophets when they were defective in them. See Isaiah xliii. 22—24. Mal. i. throughout, and chap. iii. 7—10.

12. "Many other things besides the death of Christ are expressly called *sacrifices* by the sacred writers; and if it be universally allowed that they are so called by way of allusion only, why may not the same be the case with the death of Christ also." *Theological Repository*, vol. I. p. 131.—"Christ, being called a *priest* can occasion no difficulty, when it is considered, that ordinary Christians have frequently the same appellation in the New Testament," &c. Ib. p. 132.

I have already shewn, that such things are spoken of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, as are inconsistent with the metaphorical use of the terms, and that

* The account of Saul's behaviour in the affair of the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xv. and the reproof given him on that occasion, set this matter in a very clear light. "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice; and to hearken than the fat of rams." ver. 22.

that of consequence they belong to our Lord in the proper sense of the words. Where the terms in question are used figuratively, we are obliged to put this construction upon them, either because the texts themselves intimate their figurative meaning, or because other passages of scripture require it. When the whole Jewish nation is called a kingdom of priests, Exod. xix. 6. we are obliged to look upon this language as figurative, because other scriptures assure us, that none could be real priests under the Mosaic dispensation but those who were of the family of Levi. And the services of Christians are plainly distinguished from real sacrifices, by being called *SPIRITUAL sacrifices*, *LIVING sacrifices*, *sacrifices OF PRAISE*, &c. 1 Pet. ii. 5. Rom. xiii. 1. Heb. xiii. 15; but they are never called *sacrifices FOR SIN*; by which, and other such like epithets, the sacrifice of Christ is distinguished from those things which have the term applied to them merely by way of allusion.

13. "The death of Christ cannot be considered
 " as a proper sacrifice for sin, because many things
 " essential to such a sacrifice were, in fact, wanting
 " in it.—According to the Jewish ceremonial law
 " (from which we must borrow all our notions of
 " these things) it was primarily requisite, in every
 " sin-offering, that it should be provided, and pre-
 " sented by the sinner; Christ, therefore, could not
 " die as a proper sacrifice for a sinful world, except
 " the world had provided, and presented him to be
 " sacrificed, and also observed a variety of other
 " forms, of which there is no trace in the history of
 " the death of Christ." lb. p. 133.

The sum of this argument is, that nothing is a *sacrifice*, in the proper sense of the word, which is not

accompanied with all those ceremonies, which were appointed for the Jews by the law of Moses: But if such are not *proper* sacrifices, they must only be *figurative* ones, having that title applied to them in allusion to real sacrifices. Now, I would beg leave to ask our author, of what kind were the sacrifices of the heathen world? They certainly were not accompanied with all the Jewish ceremonies; and yet I think he will scarcely say they were but figurative. He has himself asserted, that "sacrifices" (in the proper sense of the word) "were as familiar to the Gentiles as to the Jews." *Ib.* p. 135. and if so, what becomes of this argument against the sacrifice of Christ? The true notion of a *sacrifice for sin*, if I rightly understand it, is, that of "something devoted to death as the means of expiating guilt, or removing the obligation to punishment from the offender." The efficacy of this depends intirely upon the appointment of God, and is a distinct consideration.

14. "The death and crucifixion of Christ was the grand objection to the religion which the apostles preached. It was strongly urged both by Jews and Gentiles. To the former it was a stumbling block, and to the latter foolishness. It cannot, therefore, appear surprising, that the apostles should make use of all the means in their power to lessen the force of so formidable an objection. And what could tend more to this purpose, than to take every opportunity of speaking of it in terms borrowed from the Jewish ritual? The same method was equally calculated to strick the Gentiles, to whom sacrifices were as familiar as the Jews." *Ib.* p. 135.

When we consider the doctrine of the Socinians, that "Christ taught nothing but the dictates of plain
" morality,

“ morality, and sober good sense;”* that “ there
 “ is nothing *new* in the christian system besides the
 “ motives to virtue there exhibited;”† that “ the
 “ New Testament phraseology, of Christ’s *dying for*
 “ *our offences, bearing our sins*, and the like, imply no-
 “ thing more than barely suffering in the cause of
 “ virtue and mankind;”‡ that “ Christ fell a vic-
 “ tim to the licentiousness of the nation he belong-
 “ ed to, and the age he lived in;” and that “ cases
 “ of this kind are not uncommon in the course of
 “ providence:”§ I say, when we consider these
 things, and suppose that Christianity contains nothing
 more than these sentences imply, what is there in
 the death of Christ that should make it a stumbling
 block to the Jews, or foolishness to the Gentiles?
 Surely there was no need that the apostles should
 take every opportunity of referring to the Jewish ri-
 tual, to make this doctrine be embraced by the learn-
 ed Greeks and Romans, to whom the idea of a man’s
 dying in the cause of virtue and mankind was quite
 familiar. It appears highly improbable, (to say the
 least) that such a representation of the death of Christ
 should have been treated as foolishness and a my-
 sterious affair by the civilized Gentile nations, when
 cases of this kind were not uncommon in the world,
 and were greatly applauded by them. And this con-
 sideration affords a strong presumption, that the a-
 postles gave a different representation of the death of
 Christ, with respect to the relation it bore to man-
 kind. If the gospel be only “ the dictates of plain
 “ morality and sober sense,” with the assurance
 “ that

* Theological Repository, vol. i. p. 32.

† Mr Graham’s Letters, p. 33.

‡ Ibid. p. 56.

§ Ibid. p. 59.

“ that the respective effects of virtue and vice shall
 “ take place beyond the grave ;” what propriety
 can there be in the apostle’s representation of it as
 something “ which the world knew not, a mystery
 “ hidden from ages and generations, the wisdom of
 “ God in a mystery, which none of the princes of
 “ this world knew, nay, which the angels desire to
 “ look into ?” But that the WORD, who *in the be-*
ginning was with God, and was God, should take upon
 him our nature, and make himself a sacrifice for us,
 that we might be restored to the divine favour, and
 partake of eternal felicity ; this is such a display of
 mercy and justice as deserves all those high expressions
 which the inspired writers bestow upon it.

15. “ That the offering of an animal on the altar
 “ was considered, in the law of Moses, in the same
 “ light as any other gift or offering, and a sacrifice
 “ for sin, as any other sacrifice, is evident from sever-
 “ al circumstances in their ritual, and several facts in
 “ the Jewish history.” *Theological Repository*, p.
 200. vol. I. The circumstances and historical facts
 brought to prove this opinion, are these.

(1.) “ In many cases, when a person was not able
 “ to provide an animal for sacrifice, an offering of
 “ flour was accepted.” lb.

This shews, that God prefers mercy to sacrifice,
 and, therefore, in cases of necessity, dispenses with
 the observance of his own positive institutions ; but
 does by no means prove, that sacrifices for sin were
 only considered as gifts or presents. The necessity
 of the shedding of blood in the ordinary constitution
 of the law, is sufficient to warrant the apostle’s de-
 claration, that *without shedding of blood there is no re-*
mission ; especially, as all defects in the particular sa-
 crifices, which were not presumptuous, were remedi-
 ed

ed by the appointment of a general and annual atonement.

(2.) "The Philistines, convinced of their fault in taking captive the ark of God, return it with a present of golden mice and emrods, to make atonement for them, evidently in the place of sacrifice." *Ib.*

Our author does not surely lay much stress on this argument. If the priests and diviners of the Philistines thought fit to send their mice and emrods as a trespass-offering, on account of the particular plagues inflicted on them, it will not follow, that the sacrifices for sin instituted by God were considered in no other light than that of presents.

(3.) "In the Jewish ritual the ceremonies attending a sacrifice for sin did not differ in any thing material from those that were used in any other sacrifice," &c. p. 201. Hence our author concludes, that there was nothing vicarious in the sin-offering, and that the use and signification of this and other sacrifices were the same.

It is true, that in making the burnt-offering, and peace-offering, the offerer was commanded to lay his hand upon the head of the victim, as he did in making the sin-offering; and the sprinkling of blood was used in them all: But all this does not shew, that the sacrifices in which blood was shed, answered exactly to the use of *presents* in civil life, nor invalidate the proofs I have given, that sacrifices for sin were the consideration of forgiveness. The use of the signs mentioned indicates, I think, that the offerer was considered as a sinner in all these offerings, rather than as one who was merely making a present to the Almighty. Our author is certainly mistaken when he says, "It was not the sacrifice," but

“ but the priest, that was said in the Old Testament
 “ to make atonement :” Ib. For nothing can be
 more express than the declaration, that the sacrifice
 made atonement. *The life of the flesh is in the blood,*
and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an a-
tonement for your souls: for IT IS THE BLOOD
THAT MAKETH AN ATONEMENT for the soul.
 Lev. xvii. 11. Yet this does not contradict what is
 elsewhere said of the priest making atonement ; for
 since the blood only made atonement as shed by the
 priest according to the ritual, and the priest only
 made atonement by shedding the blood as directed,
 it comes to the same thing, whether the atonement
 be spoken of as made by the priest, or the sacrifice ;
 for both are included in either expression.

(4.) “ Whenever the writers of the Old Testa-
 “ ment treat largely concerning sacrifices, it is evi-
 “ dent, that the idea they had of them was the very
 “ same with that which they had concerning gifts,
 “ or presents of any other nature.” Ib. p. 202.

For the proof of this we are referred to the 50th
 Psalm. *Hear O my people, and I will speak; O Israel,*
and I will testify against thee: I am God, even thy
God. I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices, or thy
burnt-offerings, to have been continually before me. I
will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of
thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the
cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of
the mountains; and the wild beasts of the field are
mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee; for the
world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the
flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto
God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows unto the Most
High; And call upon me in the day of trouble, I will
deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me. Ver. 7—15.

The reader must judge for himself, what sort of proof this passage affords of our author's premisses. I confess I can see no evidence in this psalm, that God instituted sacrifices to be used as *presents* are in civil life: On the contrary, the people are reprov'd, in my apprehension, for entertaining such a notion of them, and for thinking to compensate by them for their neglect of moral duties. I agree, therefore, intirely with our author in his remark subjoined to the quotation above given. " So far did the heathens
 " give into this idea of sacrifices, as to imagine, that
 " their gods did really feast their nostrils, at least,
 " with the smell of them; and the reproof contain-
 " ed in the passage quoted above, seems to intimate
 " the prevalence of some such gross notion among
 " the Jews."

(5.) " Sacrifice was not universally necessary for
 " the purpose of making atonement; for, upon se-
 " veral occasions, we read of atonement being made
 " when there was no sacrifice. Thus Phinehas is
 " said to have made atonement for the children of
 " Israel by slaying the transgressors. Numb. xxv.
 " 13. Moses made atonement by prayer only,
 " Exod. xxxii. 30. And Aaron made atonement
 " with incense. Numb. xvi. 46, 47." lb.

The passages here quoted shews us clearly what is the scriptural notion of *making atonement*, namely, 'the removal of the obligation to punishment from an offender,' or, which comes to the same thing, the doing of something available for that purpose. What Phinehas did is thus described in the 11th verse, *Phinehas hath turned away my wrath from the children of Israel, while he was zealous for my sake among them*: This is repeated in other words in the 13th verse, after the reward of his zeal had been mentioned, *because he was zealous for his God, and made atonement*
 for

for the children of Israel. So that *making atonement*, and *turning away God's wrath*, are plainly synonymous expressions. When Moses said to the people of Israel, *Ye have sinned a great sin, and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin:* by *making atonement* he undoubtedly meant, averting the punishment due to their sin. So when Aaron ran into the midst of the congregation with fire taken from the altar, and incense thereon, he made atonement for the people, that is, he did something which averted the wrath of God, or stayed the plague begun among them. In these extraordinary cases, extraordinary methods of making atonement were accepted; but this does not at all affect my argument, which is built upon the clear declarations of holy writ, that the standing appointed method of making atonement under the ceremonial law was by sacrifice, and that this was typical of God's method of forgiving offences against the moral law, made known more fully under the gospel dispensation.

It may not be amiss in this place, to direct the reader's attention to the manner in which this author opposes the doctrine of atonement. He first proves, as he apprehends, that the death of Christ is no proper or real sacrifice for sin, nor the antitype of the Jewish sacrifices; but that it is called so merely in a figurative sense, by way of allusion to the Jewish sacrifices, because Christ *offered* himself to God for the good of mankind; that we make the same kind of sacrifice as Christ did, when we *yield our bodies living sacrifices* in God's service, or offer him *the sacrifice of praise*, or *lay down our lives for the brethren*; and of consequence, that the sacrifices under the law, were transactions of a nature quite different either from our prayers, or Christ's death.

After

After he has settled this point, he then proves, in like manner, that the legal sacrifices for sin had no relation to the remission of offences, but “ that the offering of an animal on the altar was considered in the same light as any other offering or gift.” That “ agreeable to the standing and universal custom of the East, with respect to sovereigns and great men, the Jews were never to approach the divine presence without some offering,” and that “ their sacrifices exactly answered to the use of presents in civil life.”

But how are these things consistent with each other? If Christ is said to have made himself a sacrifice because he *offered* himself to God, and real sacrifices are no more than *offerings* or presents, then the death of Christ had the nature of a real sacrifice. Or, If Christ did but make a figurative sacrifice because he merely made an offering of himself to God, then real sacrifices must be more than mere offerings or presents to the Divine Being. These two representations of the matter appear to me to be directly opposite, and, in that case, the arguments deduced from them (and our author's principal arguments, I think, are deduced from them) must destroy one another.

16. “ Some texts of scripture seem to represent the pardon of sin as dispensed in consideration of something else than our repentance or personal virtue; and according to their literal sense, the pardon of sin is, in some way or other, procured by Christ. And had the literal representation been all of a-piece, &c.—the account would have had more of the air and consistency, at least, of truth: but when the pardon of sin is sometimes represented as dispensed in consideration of the *sufferings*, sometimes of the

“ the *merit*, sometimes of the *resurrection*, and even
 “ of the *life* and *obedience* of Christ; &c. that the
 “ dispensing of pardon is sometimes said to be the
 “ proper act of God the Father; and, again, that
 “ it is Christ who forgives us; we can hardly hesi-
 “ tate in concluding, that these must be, severally,
 “ *partial representations*, in the nature of figures and
 “ allusions.” &c. lb. p. 252, 253.

Our author is as much concerned to answer this objection as they are against whom he brings it. He believes, I suppose, that the dispensing of pardon is the proper act of God the Father, yet if he hesitates to conclude that this is a *partial representation* in the nature of a figure and allusion, he gives up his argument; if he does not hesitate to make this conclusion, I should be glad to know how pardon is really dispensed without figure and allusion. If, by the terms *partial representation* and *figure*, our author had only meant that kind of figure, where a part is put for the whole, I should have had no objection to his assertion; but then his argument would have contained nothing against the reality of forgiveness being dispensed on account of the mediatorial undertaking of Christ; his death, resurrection, and intercession being parts of this, and coinciding with the idea of his making a real sacrifice for sin, as I have already shewn.

17. Many negative arguments, besides those I have taken notice of, are urged against the doctrine of atonement in the Theological Repository, among which are placed the promises of certain happiness to the righteous, and the threatenings of misery to the wicked; the prayers of holy men recorded in the Old Testament, in which they implore the mercy of God for the pardon of their sins, and make pro-

fession of their own sincerity, and the like. I think
 it quite needless to give a particular answer to every
 argument of this kind, though our author thinks
 them to be of consequence in this debate. "With
 me I own," says he, "these negative arguments
 have great weight. When I find a profound si-
 lence concerning this supposed great doctrine of
 atonement, upon occasions of which I cannot help
 thinking it would have naturally occurred; when
 I do not find that frequent mention of it, and that
 stress laid upon it, which its importance would
 certainly require; when I find no trace of it in
 any *direct message* from God, or in any *fact* re-
 corded in the sacred writings; I cannot help
 thinking that divines must have been mistaken
 concerning its supposed truth and importance."
 p. 266.

I readily allow, that the scriptures are silent with
 respect to this doctrine, upon occasions on which this
 author thinks it would have occurred, had it been
 true; and if he will inform me, why divine reve-
 lation was not given to mankind at first in its great-
 est degree of clearness, without the slow succession
 of dispensations, the last always improving on those
 which preceded; and why men were left to wait
 four thousand years before *life and immortality were*
brought to light, though they had message upon mes-
 sage from God in that long interval; I will then ac-
 quaint him, why the doctrine of atonement was not
 clearly revealed on those occasions on which he thinks
 it ought to have been taught, if it were a doctrine
 of divine revelation.* I leave the reader to judge,
 when

* It might here have answered our author in his own words,
 inserting the term *atonement* instead of *a future state*; for thus
 he argues concerning the latter, "To ask why this impor-
 tant

when he has considered what I have urged in defence of this doctrine, whether or not there are “ traces “ of it in *direct messages* from God, and in *facts* recorded in the sacred writings.”

18. Our author has attempted to shew, in his *Familiar Illustration*, that many of those passages of scripture, which are usually brought to prove the doctrine of atonement, will admit of a natural interpretation upon other principles. In his introduction to these criticisms, he says, that the death of Christ “ being compared to *so many things*, and things of “ *such different natures*,” as a sacrifice, a passover, a ransom, &c. “ proves that the resemblance in all “ of them is only in *certain respects*, and that they “ differ considerably in others.—These, (says he) “ are all bold, but significant figures of speech, the “ death of Christ really corresponding to them all “ to a certain degree; but they differ so widely “ from one another, that no one thing can corre- “ spond to any of them throughout; for then it “ must exclude all, or at least most of the rest.” *Illustration*, p. 47.

There is no necessity to suppose, that each circumstance of every institution which was designed to typify the method of our redemption by Christ, should have something corresponding to it in the antitype; because many, if not all of those institutions, had other purposes to answer, besides that of being types

“ tant doctrine of a future state was not revealed, or not re- “ vealed with the same fulness of evidence before the time of “ Christ, or why it is not known at present to the whole “ world, is the same thing as to ask, why, in all the works “ of nature and providence, and in all the dispensa- “ tions of God to mankind, a similar gradation is observed, “ and why nothing under the government of God is brought “ to perfection at once.” *Theological Repository*, vol. I. p. 362

types of our redemption. The propitiatory sacrifices, as I have already observed, were branches of a political law, and had an immediate reference to crimes committed against God as civil governor. Various circumstances belonging to them might be needful in this respect, which were not intended to be typical. The same may be said with regard to the passover, and other types of Christ. Besides, so many things were to be prefigured concerning our Redeemer, that no one institution could exhibit them all, and therefore it was necessary that different types should be appointed. The whole ceremonial law did but afford an imperfect resemblance of the things it typified; it was but *the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things.*

19. It is asserted, that "sacrifices for sin under the law of Moses are never considered as standing in the place of the sinner." 1b. p. 49.

The expression, "standing in the place of the sinner," is somewhat ambiguous: it may mean either *suffering precisely the same punishment to which the sinner was obnoxious, or suffering what is sufficient to free the sinner from punishment.* It is in the latter sense only that Christ is our substitute. He did not suffer precisely the same punishment which we deserve on account of our sins, for that is *eternal death*, or the being given up to a state of perfect sin and misery for ever; but he suffered what is sufficient to free the offender from this deserved punishment, in the way prescribed in the word of God. And in this sense it is evident, the propitiatory sacrifices under the law stood in the place of the sinner; for the death of the animal, according to the ritual, freed him from that punishment, to which without it he would have been exposed. He was not liable to punishment

nishment merely on account of neglecting to offer the sacrifice which God had appointed; but he was considered as guilty previously to such an offering. *If a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord, though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity. And he shall bring a ram for a trespass-offering, &c. Lev. v. 17, 18.* In these sacrifices, the life of the animal was given for the offender, and, on this account the blood was appointed as the standing means of making atonement. *The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul,—for it is the life of all flesh, THE BLOOD OF IT IS FOR THE LIFE THEREOF, chap. xvii. 11. 14.* It is plain from this text, that it was not the penitent disposition of the offender, but the sacrifice which made atonement.

20. “Many persons are carried away with the sound of the word *redemption*, as if it necessarily implied, that mankind being in a state of bondage; a price must be paid for their freedom, and that the death of Christ was that price. But the word which we render *redemption* signifies only deliverance in general, in whatever manner it be effected.” *Ib.*

It is true that nothing can be concluded from the word *redemption*, with respect to the manner in which we are redeemed. This must be inquired after in other parts of scripture; and from thence we learn, that we are delivered from the punishment of our sins by the interposition of our Redeemer as a sacrifice for sin. *What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God hath done, sending his*

his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, (or, according to the marginal reading, by a sacrifice for sin,) condemned sin in the flesh, Rom. viii. 3. He made him to be sin (or a sin offering,) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 21.

21. " Great stress is laid upon the word *for*, as if " Christ dying *for* all, necessarily implied that he " died *in the stead or place* of all." Ib. p. 50.

The mere use of the word *for* certainly proves nothing in this case; but when it is joined with other expressions which imply substitution, as *propitiatory sacrifice*, &c. or when it is intimated to us that Christ died *for* us in such a sense as can be applied to no other, (see 1 Cor. i. 13.) then we are necessarily led to lay such stress upon the word *for*; as would otherwise be improper.

22. " Much stress has also been laid on Christ " being said to *bear the sins of mankind*; as if they " had been ascribed or imputed to him, and he had " taken them upon himself, and suffered the wrath " of God for them, *He shall bear their iniquities*, " Isa. liii. &c. But the word does not signify to " bear, or *take upon another*, but to *bear away*, or *re-* " *move*, by whatever means.—The phrase *bearing* " *sin* is never applied in the Old Testament but to " the *scape-goat*, which was not sacrificed, but turn- " ed loose into the wilderness, to signify the removal " of the sins of the people, which God had forgiven: " —The evangelist Matthew had, most evidently, " this idea of the meaning of the passage in Isaiah, " when he applied it upon the occasion of Christ's " healing the bodily diseases of men, viii. 17. For " he says, that he performed these cures, *that it might* " *be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah,*
Himself

"Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." lb. p. 50, 51.

Supposing the expression *bearing sin* to signify in the New Testament *bearing it away*, the sense of the passages in which it is used will be the same; for how did Christ *bear away* the sins of many, but by being offered up for them as a sacrifice? Now once in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26. Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation, ver. 28. The mention of his appearing a second time, WITHOUT SIN, will, I think, most naturally lead to the rendering which our translators have chosen; but however that be, the text plainly declares, that Christ *puts away our sins by the sacrifice of himself*, and that is all we contend for. The same sentiment is conveyed by St Peter, when he says, *Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed*, 1 Pet. ii. 24. Here likewise the removal of our sins is attributed to the sacrifice which Christ made on the cross; which was offered up, that we, being healed by his stripes, might serve him in righteousness here, and partake of his eternal felicity hereafter.

I am surprised at the assertion, that "the phrase *bearing sin* is never applied in the Old Testament, but to the scape-goat," since that, and *bearing iniquity*, which means precisely the same, are very common phrases in the Old Testament, and generally signify *bearing the punishment of sin, or making atonement for iniquity*.* The goat that was slain, and the

* As Lev. x. 17. God hath given you the sin-offering to BEAR THE INIQUITY of the congregation, to make atonement for them before

the goat let loose in the wilderness on the great day of atonement, were considered as *one* sacrifice: *And Aaron shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for A SIN-OFFERING, and one ram for a burnt-offering, &c.* Lev. xvi. 5. Accordingly they are both spoken of as making atonement: They were both likewise made ceremonially accursed, and equally defiled the persons who touched them; for neither the man who led the *scape-goat* into the wilderness, nor he that carried out the flesh of the *goat slain*, could return into the camp until he had *washed his cloaths, and bathed his flesh in water*. From all which it is probable, that the two goats were intended to point out the same thing in different respects, the one by its death, the *means* of pardon, the other by its removal into the wilderness, the *certainty* of it.

Because St. Matthew applies the prophet's prediction of Christ's *bearing our griefs and carrying our sorrows* to his removing the bodily diseases of men, it will not follow, that this was all the prophet meant when he foretold that the Messiah should be *wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, that by his stripes we might be healed; that he should bear the sin of many, and that the Lord should lay on him the iniquity of us all*. I believe it is impossible for any one to think so while he reads the 53d chapter of Isaiah: and it is evident, that our author himself thinks otherwise, because he speaks of this passage as a prediction of our Lord's own sufferings. *Theological Repository*, vol. I. p. 129. But the difficulty arising

before the Lord. Chap. xxii. 9. *They shall keep mine ordinance, lest they BEAR SIN for it, and die therefore if they profane it.* Numb. ix. 13 *The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the passover: even the same soul shall be cut off from the people—that man shall BEAR his SIN, &c.*

ing from the application of the prophet's words by the evangelist will vanish, when we consider, that sometimes in the New Testament a prophetic declaration is said to be fulfilled in an event, to which it may with great propriety be applied, though it was not originally, or primarily at least, spoken of that event. Such an application proves that the prediction was true in that sense, but not that it is to be restrained to that sense. We have two instances of this kind of application in the gospel written by St. Mathew. See chap. ii. 15. compared with Hosea xi. 1. And ver. 17, 18. of the same chap. compared with Jer. xxxi. 15. Some Socinian writers give a different turn to that clear description of our Saviour's vicarious sufferings in the 53d chap. of Isaiah: They look upon this passage as containing only "a beautiful description of suffering innocence," and suppose the prophet meant no more than to intimate that Christ "was so free from the suspicion of guilt, that his calamity must be charged to the offence of others; and so extraordinary were his sufferings for their number and greatness,—that whereas the rest of the nation had been very corrupt, it *seemed as if* God had laid on him the iniquity of them all. The phrase of suffering for the sins of men," say they, "as it necessarily implies innocence in the sufferer, so it does not necessarily imply any thing farther."* This is a very easy method of putting an end to this, or any other controversy. There needs no more than to paraphrase the clearest declarations of holy writ, as this author has paraphrased those of Isaiah, which are almost as clear as any in the bible, and the matter is settled at once. It SEEMS, may any one say, AS IF the wicked should be turned into hell, and all the people that forget God; Psal. ix. 17.

F

but

* Mr Graham's Letters on the Atonement, p. 60, 61.

but this is only a beautiful way of frightening men to their duty. And, indeed, if the phrase of *suffering for the sins of men* necessarily implies no more than *innocence in the sufferer*, I cannot see how the inspired writers could by any expressions whatever convey the doctrine of atonement, even supposing it to be their design; for the same liberty of interpretation would set aside any declaration of this kind, and render the most positive evidence of no effect.

23. "Christ is said to die a *curse* for us, because
 " the manner of his death was similar to that by
 " which those who were deemed *curfed* under the
 " law were put to death. *Christ hath redeemed us*
 " *from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;*
 " *for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth*
 " *on a tree.*" Illust. p. 51, 52.

In whatever sense we understand the expression *being made a curse for us*, this much is plain from the words of the text, that we, i. e. all true believers, are delivered from that penalty to which our breach of the law of God exposes us, which is here called the *curse of the law*, by the sufferings of our Redeemer: and this proves the truth of the doctrine of atonement. It is not supposed that Christ was "under the displeasure of God," if by *displeasure* is understood *dislike* or *disapprobation*; but that his sufferings, being inflicted by God as a righteous judge, were truly *penal*, and delivered the penitent offender from the curse of the moral law, as the propitiatory sacrifices delivered the Jews from the curse of the ceremonial.

24. "The death of Christ is called a *passover*, because it may be considered as a sign of our deliverance from the power of sin, as the passover among the Jews was a sign of their deliverance from the Egyptian bondage," Ib. p. 47.

The

The passover, at its first institution, afforded the Israelites an assurance, and a very significant token, of their preservation from the judgment of God, and of their deliverance from bondage: But what token did the death of Christ afford of our deliverance from the power of sin, according to the account which the Socinians give of it? God permitted an innocent man to be cruelly put to death by a licentious people, therefore we shall be delivered from the power of sin:—I think it requires uncommon penetration to discover here the agreement between the sign, and the thing signified. Whereas, the death of Christ affords a most striking token of our deliverance from sin, if we consider him as giving himself for us, that he might free us from the deserved punishment of our sins, and procure those divine communications of the Holy Spirit, whereby we are delivered from the power of sin, and enabled to serve God in righteousness and true holiness. If to the apostle's declaration in 1. Cor. v. 7. *Christ our passover is sacrificed for us*, we add the consideration of that special injunction given to the Jews, not to break a bone of the paschal lamb, compared with the reason given for the preservation of our Lord's bones, *These things were done, that the scripture should be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken.* John xix. 36. we shall see reason to conclude, that the Jewish institution had a typical respect to the sacrifice of our Redeemer: And it is probable, that this type was designed to exhibit the *benefits* included in our redemption by Christ, as the sacrifices for sin did the *means* of that redemption.

25. “ Many divines, finding themselves obliged
 “ to give up the notion of Christ's suffering *in our*
 “ *stead*,—alledge, however, that God forgives the
 “ sins of mankind *on account of the merit of Christ,*
 “ and

“ *and his intercession for us*; this opinion, like the
 “ former, is-favoured by the literal sense of a few
 “ passages of scripture; but is contrary to the gene-
 “ ral and plain tenor of it, which represents all acts of
 “ mercy as proceeding from the essential placability
 “ and goodness of God the Father only.” lb. p. 52.

It is true, that in the Old Testament the mercy of God is generally mentioned alone when our forgiveness is spoken of, though many intimations are there given of the respect which our Lord's sufferings have to this event. It must be acknowledged likewise, that the doctrine of atonement, and some other important truths, were not so clearly taught even by our Lord during his personal ministry, as they were after his ascension by his inspired messengers, agreeable to his own design and declaration: John xvi. 12, 13. But in the epistolary part of the New Testament, the necessity and efficacy of a mediator is constantly inculcated in all the variety of expression. We are said to be “ justified by the
 “ blood of Christ, accepted through the beloved,
 “ to have redemption through his blood, even the
 “ forgiveness of sin, to be justified in the name of
 “ the Lord Jesus, reconciled to God by his death,
 “ &c.” In short, our acceptance with God through the mediation of Christ is a truth inscribed on almost every page of the apostle's epistolary addresses to the Christian church. And here I would beg leave to remind the reader, that we have the clearest display of Christianity in the epistles of the New Testament, every thing necessary to complete the system of divine revelation, being finished when the inspired penmen composed these parts of holy writ. All that our Lord thought fit to leave unsaid, had been revealed to the apostles by his spirit, as he had promised,

mised. His death, and resurrection, with the subsequent events, had dispelled all darkness from the minds of the disciples. They now saw clearly the fulfilment of the Old Testament types and prophecies concerning the Messiah, and were no longer in doubt with regard to his character and offices. In the epistolary part of the New Testament; therefore, we have declared unto us *the whole counsel of God*, and herein it is asserted, with the greatest precision, that our justification does not flow solely from the goodness of the Father, without any other medium than our repentance and reformation; but that mercy is extended to repenting and believing sinners through the Son, and that they only are intitled to salvation who *come unto God through him*. *

Our author has an argument of another kind against that idea of Christ's intercession, which is included in the doctrine of atonement. "Besides, (says he) there are many passages in the Old Testament in which God is represented as forgiving the Israelites, and receiving them into his favour on the account of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and their posterity plead the merit of these their religious ancestors in their prayers."—"Admitting, therefore, that God may grant favours to mankind at
F 3 "the

* The author of the *Illustration* appears to have a very different notion of this part of holy writ. He talks of the "Jewish disguise," which the apostles, and especially St. Paul, have put upon the plain truth of God; and, after telling us what he esteems the true gospel, makes this remark, which some of my readers may probably think an extraordinary one. "However, the disguise in which this simple religion appears, as delivered to us through the hands of the apostles, and primitive fathers, is not so close, but that, with proper attention, we are able to look through it, and discern its true lineaments." *Theological Repository*, vol. 1. p. 428.

“ the intercession of Christ, this is not a privilege
 “ *peculiar* to Christ, but is common to him and o-
 “ ther good men who went before him; so that the
 “ *general system* of the forgiveness of sin can by no
 “ means depend upon the merit and intercession of
 “ Christ only.” lb. p. 53.

The passages of scripture quoted from the Old Testament on this occasion,† and other texts, plainly shew, that God has often granted favours to men for the sake of their religious ancestors, and at the intercession of others; but they prove nothing farther. The doctrine of atonement implies, that no transgression of the moral law, considered as such, is forgiven, without a respect had to the mediation of Christ; and this differs greatly from any efficacy which can be shewn to belong to the prayers of righteous men. Our Saviour, in the days of his flesh, interceded for others in a manner peculiar to himself. He addressed the Father in his own name, and in language by no means suitable to any other suppliant; *Father, I WILL*, John xvii. 24. Whereas he commands us to approach the throne of Grace in *his* name, and proposes that he himself will answer our petitions, John xiv. 13, 14, &c. The intercession which Christ is now making in heaven for us, appears from the word of God to be of a different kind from that which holy men are capable of making

† Gen. xxvi. 24. *Fear not, I am with thee, and I will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake*, Ex. xxxii. 13. *Remember Abraham, and Isaac, and Israel, thy servants*. Dent. ix. 27. *Remember thy servants Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. Look not to the stubbornness of this people, nor to their sin*. In all which texts there is a reference made to that covenant which God graciously established with Abraham, that his seed should be numerous, that they should inherit the land of Canaan, &c as the reader will find upon consulting the chapters from whence these passages are taken.

ing for others. It is of the nature of that intercession which the High-priest made on the day of atonement, when he entered the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrifice; and, therefore, is mentioned in the scriptures with a particular reference to his death: *He bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.* Isaiah liii. 12. *It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us,* Rom. viii. 34. *He is able to save them to the uttermost who come unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them; being such an high priest, — who needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice, — for this he did once when he offered up himself,* Heb. vii. 25, &c. *Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, — but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us,* chap. ix. 24. This intercession of our Lord, being the consequence of his giving himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and, as it were, the continuance of that transaction, is, therefore, of a peculiar nature, and has a peculiar influence on the remission of sins, which no intercession of any pious man on earth can have.

The intercession of the Spirit of God for us is likewise a distinct thing from the intercession of Christ. The Spirit maketh intercession for us by interceding in us, that is, by exciting in the minds of true Christians unfeigned desires after God, and every holy temper implied in the *fervent prayer of a righteous man.* *The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what to pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us,* WITH GROANINGS WHICH CANNOT BE UTTERED, Rom. viii. 26.

V. In the foregoing pages I have taken very little notice of Mr Graham's Letters on the doctrine of
Atone-

Atonement, though they are the latest of the publications I have occasion to examine, and are strongly recommended by the author of the *Appeal*.* The principal arguments which they contain are urged, and expressed with more candor, in the tracts I have been considering; and as my intention was to have nothing to do but with arguments, I chose to make my reply to those pieces which were the most candid and argumentative. Indeed, I find myself unwilling to take any notice of an author, who is perpetually misrepresenting the question he debates, and who strives to strengthen his arguments by invective and abuse of his opponents. However, it may not be amiss to give some specimens of this writer's manner of treating his subject.

1. He observes, that "nothing tends more to introduce confusion into our ideas of religion than equivocal terms, and undefined unscriptural language." p. 5. Yet he seems not to have kept clear of this error, which he justly esteems to be very hurtful to religion. In his first letter, he examines into the meaning of the word *satisfaction*. "Sometimes, (says he) it denotes the pleasure which the mind takes in any thing that is the object of our hopes and pursuits; very often it means the redressing of grievances, and repairing damages and injuries done or received; and, lastly, it denotes
" the

* "I shall take the opportunity of this preface to recommend—that excellent sermon of Mr Graham's, intitled, *Repentance the only condition of final acceptance*, and also his *Letters on the doctrine of atonement*. In these pieces the reader will find what I think to be a fair and undisguised account of what is most essential in the religion of the gospel, expressed with a plainness and energy almost peculiar to the author." *Preface to a sermon preached on occasion of the Author's resigning his pastoral care of a congregation in Leeds.*

" the obedience due to the commands of a superior,
 " properly made known to us, p. 3, 4. This
 " last he calls the scripture notion of the term *satis-*
 " *faction* as applied to Christ," p. 6. and tells us,
 that " in the other sense of it, as implying a re-
 " paration of injuries, it is not to be found in the
 " New Testament, as applicable to Christ." p. 5.
 This manner of speaking of the term *satisfaction*,
 tends, I should think, to make the reader suppose,
 that the writers of the New Testament apply it to
 Christ in the third of those senses which Mr G. has
 here given. Whereas the word is not to be found
 in the New Testament, nor is it ever applied to the
 Messiah in the old Testament, unless Isaiah liii. 11.
 is to be excepted: *He shall see the travail of his soul,*
and shall be satisfied. Our author might, therefore,
 have spared himself the trouble of defining a term
 which the scripture does not make use of, especially
 as he himself almost always uses it in a sense different
 from that which he calls the scripture notion of the
 term. I have wholly omitted the word *satisfac-*
tion in my defence of the doctrine of atonement,
 for the reason I have just given; and indeed, I
 should be far from troubling myself about a doctrine
 that rested on the meaning of a few equivocal ex-
 pressions.

Punishment is another of those terms, which Mr
 Graham has taken pains to clear up; but he often
 uses the word in a sense that is inconsistent with his
 own definition of it. " Punishment (he says) is
 " suffering for immoral behaviour, p. 23. and
 " therefore, the *innocent* cannot be *punished* in the
 " room of the guilty, without supposing him capable
 " of those disagreeable sensations which attend the
 " guilty, which is impossible." p. 29. Yet he fre-
 quently

quently talks about the punishment of the innocent :
 As, " Can a manifest act of injustice (for such I con-
 sider the punishment of the innocent) ever be the
 means of conciliating his favour who loveth right-
 teousness? p. 30. Can the honour of government
 be vindicated by punishing the innocent in the
 room of the guilty. p. 24. Upon this scheme the
 righteous are not even upon a level with the wick-
 ed; for they are punished, while the wicked e-
 scape, ib. Better that many guilty should escape,
 than that one innocent person should be punished."
 ib. Here, if I may be allowed the expression, Mr
 G.'s common sense gets the better of his critical
 knowledge, and constrains him to use the word *pu-
 nishment* in its ordinary signification, that of ' suffer-
 ing inflicted by judicial proceeding.* If the ideas
 of *innocence* and *punishment* were incompatible, it
 would be as absurd to talk of the injustice of punish-
 ing the innocent, as the injustice of murdering the
 dead.

Atonement being the subject of Mr G.'s letters,
 one might suppose he would be very clear in his de-
 finition of this; but he only informs us what it is
 not, and leaves us to find out its true meaning by
 ourselves. " Atonement (says he) I will allow,
 was made by the death of an animal, but you
 must not therefore infer, that it was slain in the
 room of the offender. And though I may not
 be able to assign the precise notion of atonement,
 what it was, wherein it consisted, and what was
 the end and design of it, I think I am pretty sure
 " what

* In punishment the suffering is inflicted by *authority* ei-
 ther real or usurped, and with *design*, the latter distinguishes
 it from *casualty*, and the former from *violence* or *assault*. This
 authoritative design constitutes what is here termed judicial
 proceeding.

“ what it was *not*. It did by no means express a
 “ *substitution*,” &c. p. 46. Yet this author uses
 the term continually, as if it were a word perfectly
 understood by the reader.

2. When Mr G. represents the sentiments of those
 who believe the doctrine of atonement, he gives no
 authorities for his representations, nor does he quote
 a single author who has written in defence of this
 doctrine. I shall not scruple, therefore to charge
 him with *misrepresentation*, till he has quoted some
 author of credit as an authority for such accounts of
 this doctrine as the following passages contain.†

“ The representation given by Theologians of the
 “ administration of the universe is, that the omnipo-
 “ tent arm at the head of it was actually lifted up,
 “ ready to strike the blow, and discharge the thun-
 “ der-bolt on a sinful world, when Christ seasonably
 “ interposed, to wrest it out of his hands, p. 14. I
 “ need not caution you against viewing the best of
 “ beings in the light of a tyrant, determined to
 “ make sinful men for ever miserable, had not Jesus
 “ interposed, p. 15. Had the advocates for this
 “ monstrous scheme, been attentive to the amiable
 “ light in which nature, not to say revelation, ex-
 “ hibits the deity, they never would have admit-
 “ ted the idea of *implacability*. By saying he is *pla-*
 “ *cable* only in consideration of a *satisfaction*, it is
 “ plain

† By *authors of credit* I mean such as Bishop Stillingfleet,
 amongst those of the Church of England, and Dr Watts a-
 mongst the Dissenters. Both these writers have taken pains
 to state the doctrine of atonement, that it might be clearly
 seen what they undertook to vindicate; and from them Mr
 Graham might have given a distinct account of what he op-
 poses: But instead of this, he exhibits the reasoning of some
 anonymous Antinomians, as the language of those who be-
 lieve this doctrine. See p. 31.

" plain they had no other idea; and yet this is say-
 " ing nothing, and worse than nothing; for it is still
 " holding him up in the light of a capricious being,
 " who is pleased with expensive offerings, and moved
 " by foreign considerations to do what he is not na-
 " turally and essentially disposed to do, p. 16. I
 " see a manifest propriety in the sufferings of an in-
 " nocent and good being to bring about the noblest
 " purposes of providence, but none at all upon the
 " scheme of satisfaction.—This is, if I may be allow-
 " ed the expression, a *luscious doctrine*, which the
 " mobility are exceedingly fond of; and no wonder,
 " indeed, they should, for it permits them to grati-
 " fy their sensual passions at the same time that it
 " flatters their heavenly hopes, p. 30. What
 " else is Calvinism," (and they who hold the doc-
 " trine of atonement are generally by this author de-
 " nominated Calvinists)* " but a *commuting system*,
 " where considerations foreign to moral character
 " are made to supply the want of it: where an ex-
 " ternal and vicarious righteousness is substituted in
 " the room of a real and personal one." p. 72.

3. Mr G.'s letters abound with invective, and a-
 " buse of those whose sentiments he opposes. " What-
 " ever charms it (the doctrine of atonement) might
 " have for the visionary and licentious, no sober or
 " sensible man would ever become its apologist, p.
 " 52. I think the doctrine of Christ's atonement,
 " as believed by the bulk of professed Christians,
 " opens

* " I know no medium between *Calvinism*, properly so
 " called, and *Socinianism*. The latter is a scheme friendly
 " to virtue, and permits one to go quietly through the world
 " in the exercise of his reasonable faculties. The former is
 " a religious *scare-crow*, that, like the Inquisition in Popish
 " countries, has long served the purpose of making hypo-
 " crites and slaves in Protestant ones." P. 75. *Note.*

“ opens a wide gap for the introduction of such evils
 “ into society, as would soon sap the foundation of
 “ it, were it not check’d by better principles of na-
 “ ture’s planting.—But for this a Calvinist would
 “ be a consistent being throughout, and form his
 “ practice upon his principles ; and, in that case,
 “ I think we should have as much occasion for gib-
 “ bets as we have for churches, p. 64, 65. The
 “ abettors of this doctrine, not much accustomed to
 “ argument, and knowing that reason is not in their
 “ interest, generally intrench themselves behind the
 “ authority of *great numbers* and *great names*, p.
 “ 65. Their general character is known to be that
 “ of bigotry to their own modes and sentiments,
 “ without any grains of charitable allowance for
 “ those that differ from them.” P. 69. Some rea-
 ders may wonder why such abuse is so liberally be-
 stowed on this occasion. Mr G. tells us he has re-
 ceived personal affronts from some who hold the doc-
 trine he opposes, and perhaps the remembrance of
 them might somewhat influence his mind while he
 was writing. “ Where will you find a Theologian,”
 says he, “ who will defend them” (the sentiments
 he opposes) “ by other arguments than those of *an-*
 “ *athemas* and *execrations* ? I and others have lately
 “ had some specimens of the politeness and humani-
 “ ty by which they are distinguished in this respect,”
 p. 75. Yet we are not to suppose that our author
 means to speak contemptuously in all this ; for he
 himself assured us to the contrary. “ I would not,”
 says he, “ by what I have said, be understood to
 “ insinuate a contempt for popular prejudices, or
 “ that they ought to be treated with contempt. I
 “ would have them, on the other hand, treated with
 “ all imaginable lenity.” lb.

4. There is an argument or two in Mr G.'s letters, which I have not had occasion to take notice of in examining the tracts before referred to : These I shall now consider.

(1.) Mr G. asserts, that the doctrine of atonement is contrary to the principles of natural religion, as they are deducible from the conduct of divine providence in the world. " The remedies provided " in nature for those who hurt themselves by their " vices ;" " the affection which all animals are observed to have for their offspring," and " the " disposition which we find in ourselves to forgive " injuries," are, in his opinion, " *proofs* that God " will pardon his offending offspring upon their penitence." p. 8, 9, 10. The intelligent reader, I apprehend, will think these proofs not very conclusive ; for the conclusion has certainly no necessary connection with its premisses. If our author would draw a real proof of his doctrine from the constitution of nature, he must make it appear, that repentance does in all cases avert or remove those natural punishments of sin which God has appointed in the world. But it is evidently otherwise. ' The ' miseries which, in the regular course of nature, ' are the consequences of wickedness, are properly ' considered as the natural punishments of it. Some ' of them follow it with a swifter, others with a ' slower pace ; some are transitory, others of longer ' continuance : but the penitence of a criminal, ' even before their arrival, affords him no security ' against the slowest of them ; and when either his ' fears or his feelings have worked a reformation, ' such as are naturally of longer continuance are not ' by that reformation presently removed. What- ' ever then can be alleged, concerning the ends of punish-

"punishment, or the satisfaction made by a reformed penitent, when applied to this subject, must be trifling. All argumentation is here precluded. We have fact and experience to convince us, that God does not always pardon the repenting sinner."* Whatever notions we may gain by the light of nature concerning the divine mercy and justice, Revelation alone can satisfy us how far, and under what circumstances, either the one or the other will be exercised towards sinners. Mr G. has sufficiently confuted himself with respect to this argument against the doctrine of atonement: for although he adopts Dr Duchal's opinion, that "it must have been an article of natural religion in all ages, and a fundamental article too, that God would forgive sin to the truly penitent," and that "all wise men must necessarily have fallen into this sentiment with much assurance;"† he nevertheless asserts, that "Mankind, before supernatural light arose upon them, were in a state of great depravity and alienation from God, sunk in ignorance, vice, and superstition;" and that "in such a state it is natural to suppose them very much at a loss as to the terms of their acceptance with God." p. 52. But how are these things consistent? If mankind in a state of natural religion were very much at a loss as to the terms of their acceptance with God, how is it that these terms are a fundamental article of natural religion, which every wise man would embrace with much assurance?‡

(1.) The

* Dr Powell's Charge in 1772. See also Butler's Analogy.

† See Dr Duchal's letter to Dr Taylor, subjoined to Mr G.'s work, p. 81.

‡ The Author of the *Appeal* seems to have fallen into the same inconsistency in his reasoning upon this subject. For after

(2.) It is said, p. 43. "Had Christ offered himself in the Jewish sense of sacrifice, that is the literal and original sense of it, he must have incurred the guilt of offering to God a human one, of all others the most offensive in his sight."

Mr G. offers nothing by way of proof of his assertion, that human sacrifices are in all cases offensive to God. I suppose, therefore, that he imagines it to be an allowed truth which no one will dispute. For my part, I am so far from thinking a human sacrifice to be in all cases an abomination to God, that I believe such an offering to have been one of the highest acts of obedience that ever was performed by

after having given extracts from several authors, by way of proof that mankind have always entertained just apprehensions of the divine mercy, he makes this inference. "It is almost demonstrable, that mankind have always considered their Maker and universal parent, in the same light with that in which reason and the scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, uniformly represent him, viz. as of himself gracious and merciful, long-suffering, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, not willing that any should perish, but desirous that all his offending creatures should repent and live." Yet when he comes to "subjoin, by way of conclusion, a concise view of the scheme of salvation by Jesus Christ," he gives this description of the state of mankind without divine revelation. "Let us, then, suppose the whole race of mankind to be in a state of apostacy from God, lost to all sense of religion and virtue, in the expressive language of scripture, *dead in trespasses and sins*; that without a revelation and a Saviour, they were in the most deplorably vicious and wretched circumstances, in a sure way to make themselves miserable both here and hereafter," &c. *Theological Repository*, vol. I. p. 416, and 422. I cannot conceive how mankind could universally entertain such sentiments of God, as are contained in divine revelation, and yet be lost to all sense of religion, and be in a sure way, without revelation, to make themselves miserable both here and hereafter.

by any mere man. *Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac*, said the Almighty to faithful Abraham, *and offer him for a burnt-offering*. This the holy man executed in intention, which was the same as to the virtuousness or viciousness of the thing, as if he had actually done it.* Yet he received the highest applause from the unerring Judge. The doctrine of atonement supposes Christ to have laid down his life for sinners in *obedience* to the will of his Father; the assertion, therefore, that this would have been a crime, or act of *disobedience*, carries absurdity on the face of it. If our author does not include this in his idea of Christ's sacrifice, he is combating a shadow, and is engaged in a contention in which he has no opponent.

Mr G. seems to me to have overturned his own arguments against the death of Christ being considered as a sacrifice for sin, in the same manner as the author of the *Appeal* has done. He asserts that "the death of Christ is stiled a sacrifice, not because it was truly and properly such in the Jewish sense of sacrifices; but because it was a distinguished expression of his regard to God. Hence also other moral virtues, such as *praise*, and *thanksgiving*, *doing good*, and *communicating*, are called by that name. In short, (says he) as the New Testament sacrifices are all spiritual and moral ones, that of Christ must be so too." p. 42. "Where he is exhibited under Mosaic and Levitical images, such as *propitiation*, and the like, it is plain that the writers use the figurative style." P. 43. "From
" all

* This seems to be the apostle's view of the matter when he says, *By faith Abraham, when he was tried, OFFERED UP Isaac; and he that had received the promises, OFFERED UP his only begotten son.* Heb. xi. 17.

"all which," (speaking of some preceding arguments, he says,) "it is evident, that Christ being called our *propitiation* is only in the allusive way, and that he could in no other sense be an atonement than that of declaring God's gracious purpose of *passing over* the sins of men, on the condition of their future repentance. Not that what he did and suffered *procured* that mercy, but were only *declarative* of it." p. 48.

When Mr G. tells us what was the nature of real propitiatory sacrifices, he gives this description of them. "Propitiatory sacrifices I consider as *public certifications*, that the offerers were either desirous of being restored, or actually were restored to the privileges of citizens; not by virtue of the sacrifice which they offered, but of the penitent disposition accompanying that sacrifice." *Ib.* "So Christ," says he, "is our *propitiation*, declaring us in a state of favour with God; not in virtue of what he suffered, but on condition only of our renewed obedience." *Ib.* Are not these two accounts of the matter manifestly inconsistent? If the proper idea of real propitiatory sacrifices be that of *public certificates*, or *declarations* of God's favour to the penitent; and if Christ is our *propitiation* precisely in the same sense, as is here asserted, then it plainly follows, that he is not called so *figuratively*, but that his death was as *real* a sacrifice as the Jewish propitiatory sacrifices were.

6. The immoral tendency of the doctrine of atonement, and the practical advantages of Socinianism, are favourite topics with Mr G; he enlarges upon them frequently in his letters. I shall, therefore, make one remark on this head before I conclude these reflections. Our author observes, that "the

“ best and surest criterion of religious principles is
 “ their moral influence: this is our Saviour’s own
 “ rule, *By their fruits shall ye know them*; the fruits
 “ which they have a tendency and fitness to pro-
 “ duce,” p. 63, 64. Now, Sir, (adds he, addressing
 himself to his friend,) “ I appeal to you, whether
 “ principles, that in any degree relax the obliga-
 “ tion of the moral law, are principles which a wise
 “ man would espouse, or an honest man defend.”

Ib. Whether our author’s doctrine has not some
 tendency to relax the obligation of the moral law, I
 leave the reader to judge, when he has considered the
 following sentence respecting moral obligation. “ To
 “ say that every the least error in moral life deserves
 “ eternal torments, is a hard saying, and who can
 “ bear it,” p. 19. How different is the language
 of scripture on this head! *The wages of sin is*
DEATH, Rom. vi. 23. *Death*, eternal death, as
 the context plainly intimates, and various other pas-
 sages declare,* is the *wages*, the due desert and re-
 ward of sin, of sin indefinitely, of every transgression
 of the moral law.

May this awful truth be written upon our hearts,
 that we may apprehend rightly the *exceeding sinfulness*
of sin, as the apostle speaks, and be led by this
 knowledge to embrace the salvation which is by Jesus
 Christ!

* As Gal. iii. 10. “ Cursed is every one that continueth
 “ not in *ALL* things which are written in the book of the law
 “ to do them. James ii. 10. Whosoever shall keep the whole
 “ law, and yet offend in *ONE* point, he is guilty of all.”

"half and half collection of religious principles
 "their moral influence: this is our Savior's
 "role. By their lives they have shown the
 "which they have a tendency and fitness to pro-
 "duce" p. 62, 64. Now, Sir, (adds he, addressing
 "himself to his friend,) "I appeal to you, whether
 "principles, that in any degree relax the obli-
 "tion of the moral law, are principles which a Chris-
 "tian man would approve, or an honest man defend."
 "1st. Whether our author's doctrine has not some
 "tendency to relax the obligation of the moral law. I
 "leave the reader to judge, when he has considered the
 "following sentence respecting moral obligation. "To
 "say that every the least error in moral doctrine
 "eternal torments, is a hard saying, and who can
 "bear it," p. 19. How different is the language
 "of scripture on this head! The wages of sin is
 "DEATH, Rom. vi. 23. Damn, eternal death, as
 "the context plainly intimates, and various other pa-
 "sages declare, * is the wages of the devil and of
 "ward of sin, of unbelief, of every man's action
 "of the moral law.
 "May this awful truth be wrought upon our hearts,
 "that we may apprehend the true the exceeding value
 "of life, as the apostle speaks, and be led by this
 "knowledge to embrace the salvation which is by Jesus
 "Christ!"



"As Gal. iii. 12. "Cursed is every one that continueth
 "not in all things which are written in the book of the law
 "to do them." James ii. 10. "Whoever shall keep the whole
 "law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."